arXiv:hep-th/0405283v2 8 Jun 2004

Università degli Studi di Milano
Facoltà di Scienze Matematiche, Fisiche e Naturali
Corso di dottorato in Fisica, XVI ciclo
Anno 2003

Tesi di Dottorato

Toward the classification of BPS solutions of $\mathcal{N} = 2$, $d = 5$ gauged supergravity with matter couplings

CANDIDATO:
Alessio Celi

RELATORE:
Prof. Daniela Zanon

Contents

Motivation **4**

1 General elements of the theory **11**
- 1.1 Introduction . . . 11
- 1.2 Supergravities in five dimension: an overview . . . 13
  - 1.2.1 Very special geometry . . . 16
  - 1.2.2 Quaternionic Geometry . . . 18
  - 1.2.3 $\mathcal{N} = 2$, $d = 5$ supergravity before gauging . . . 21
- 1.3 Supergravity Gaugings . . . 23
  - 1.3.1 Supersymmetry breaking in conventional vacua . . . 23
- 1.4 Gauged supergravities in five dimensions . . . 26
  - 1.4.1 The Moment Map . . . 27
  - 1.4.2 $\mathcal{N} = 2$ gaugings and the composite connections . . . 32
  - 1.4.3 The Fermion shifts and gravitino mass-matrix . . . 35
  - 1.4.4 The scalar potential and supersymmetry breaking . . . 37

2 Electrostatic spherically symmetric BPS solutions with Hypermultiplets **40**
- 2.1 Introduction . . . 40
- 2.2 The model and its BPS equations . . . 41
  - 2.2.1 Integrability conditions . . . 43
  - 2.2.2 Geometric restrictions . . . 46
  - 2.2.3 Further restrictions . . . 48
- 2.3 Static BPS configurations . . . 49
- 2.4 Equations of motion . . . 51
- 2.5 The Universal Hypermultiplet case . . . 52
- 2.6 Discussion and Outlook . . . 54

3 The addition of vector multiplets **56**
- 3.1 Introduction . . . 56
- 3.2 The model and its BPS equations . . . 56
  - 3.2.1 Integrability conditions . . . 58
  - 3.2.2 Matter field conditions: Hyperini equation . . . 59
  - 3.2.3 Matter field conditions: Gaugini equation . . . 61
  - 3.2.4 Further restrictions . . . 62

3.3 Static BPS configurations 64
3.4 Discussion 65

4 Bps solutions with hypermultiplets 66
4.1 Introduction 66
4.2 The Model 67
4.3 BPS equations and equations of motion 67
4.3.1 Integrability conditions 67
4.3.2 Some manipulations 69
4.3.3 Equations of motion 70
4.3.4 Compatibility 70
4.4 Hypergeometric restrictions 72
4.5 Geometric classification: results 74
4.5.1 The time-like case 76
4.6 Discussion 78

Conclusion 79

Acknowledgments 81

Appendix 82

A Conventions 83

B Equations of motion 86

C Some computations 91
C.1 Derivation of Eq.(4.3.7) 91
C.2 Derivation of Eq.(4.3.16) 92
C.3 Collecting the terms 92

D Domain walls and the Randall-Sundrum mechanism 94
D.1 The Domain Wall solution 94
D.2 The Randall Sundrum mechanism 96

Bibliography 97

Motivation

The quest for a quantum theory of gravity is one of the major challenges of theoretical physics of the last four decades.

Supergravity in different dimensions has a special role in this story: though it is not a fundamental theory it maintains a great importance because it describes the low-energy effective limit of Superstring theory, which represents the best candidate to be the right framework for unifying all fundamental interactions.

In particular the solutions to the supergravity equations of motion, especially those that preserve some supersymmetry, are of interest for many reasons. One reason is that they are useful in studying compactifications from $d = 10$ or 11 down to a lower dimensional space. By compactifying down to four spacetime dimensions, for example, one might hope to make contact with particle physics phenomenology.

Another reason resides in the existence of black holes: from the point of view of General Relativity these are simple spacetime configurations that have a singularity. Classically this is not a problem if the singularities are hidden behind event horizons, since this means that nothing can come out from the region containing the singularity. However, Hawking showed [1] that, under very general assumptions, quantum mechanics implies that black holes emit particles. Because the radiation is thermal, this leads to the problem of "information loss" and besides that it implies that black holes are thermodynamic objects. So it is a strong test for string theory to explain which are the microscopic states that justify the thermodynamic properties of the macroscopic state (the black hole), such as the area law [2]. This question is very difficult to solve in general because it is intrinsically a strong coupling problem. The BPS (extreme) black holes allow, by way of the non-renormalization theorems given by supersymmetry, to address it. Moreover, the second string revolution, with the discovery of D-branes and the understanding of duality transformations, has led to a greater comprehension of the non-perturbative structure of string theory and has thrown new light on black holes and on many others questions.

In this context supergravity plays an important role, again. The string duality transformations show that the five different superstring theories in ten dimensions represent indeed the patches at different regime of the same theory living in eleven dimensions, called M-theory. M-theory is much less understood than string theory, but one of the most important things that is known about it, is that its low-energy effective action is given by $d = 11$ supergravity.

Dp-branes are solitonic $p + 1$-dimensional extended objects, which couple to

Neveu Schwarz or to Ramond $p+1$-forms. As a consequence of open/closed string duality they admit a double interpretation: microscopically the p–brane degrees of freedom are described by a suitable *gauge theory* $\mathcal{GT}_{p+1}$ living on the $p+1$ dimensional *world volume* $\mathcal{WV}_{p+1}$ that can be either conformal or not; macroscopically each p-brane is a generalized soliton in the following sense. It is a classical solution of $d=10$ or $d=11$ supergravity interpolating between two asymptotic geometries that with some abuse of language can respectively be named *the geometry at infinity* geo^{∞} and *the near horizon geometry* geo^{H}. The latter, which only occasionally corresponds to a true event horizon, is instead universally characterized by the following property: it can be interpreted as a solution of some suitable $p+2$ dimensional supergravity $\mathcal{SG}_{p+2}$ times an appropriate *internal space* Ω_{d-p-2}. In this spirit the quantum properties of black holes can be effectively described in terms of intersecting brane solutions [3].

Because of the statement above, all space–time dimensions $11 \geq d \geq 3$ are relevant and supergravities in these diverse dimensions describe various perturbative and non–perturbative aspects of superstring theory. In particular we have a most intriguing *gauge/gravity* correspondence implying that classical supergravity $\mathcal{SG}_{p+2}$ expanded around the vacuum solution geo^{H} is dual to the quantum gauge theory $\mathcal{GT}_{p+1}$ in one lower dimension. The first remarkable example of this is offered by AdS/CFT correspondence of Maldacena [4].

There are two ways to study a supergravity theory: by compactification from higher dimensions (in this case the scalar manifold is identified as the moduli space of the internal compact space), or by direct construction of each supergravity theory in the chosen space–time dimension. In this case one uses all the *a priori* constraints provided by supersymmetry, namely the field content of the various multiplets and the global and local symmetries that the action must have. The first method makes direct contact with important aspects of superstring theory but provides answers that are specific to the chosen compact internal space Ω_{10-d} (and not fully general). The second method gives instead fully general answers. Obviously the specific answers obtained by compactification must fit into the general scheme provided by the second method.

In this thesis I want to discuss the derivation of the BPS solutions of the most general $\mathcal{N}=2$, $d=5$ gauged supergravity with matter, first derived in [5]. In particular I will concentrate on the dependence of BPS equations on the choice of gauging, in presence of non trivial hypermultiplets (not constant prepotential).

In the last few years five dimensional gauged supergravities have received a lot of attention mainly because of two developments. On one hand we have the AdS_5/CFT_4 correspondence between

a superconformal gauge theories in $d=4$, viewed as the world volume description of a stack of D3–branes

b type IIB supergravity compactified on AdS_5 times a five–dimensional internal manifold X^5 which yields a gauged supergravity model in $d=5$

On the other hand we have the quest for supersymmetric realizations of the Randall-Sundrum scenarios [6],[7] which also correspond to domain wall solutions of appropriate $d = 5$ gauged supergravities[1]. The $\mathcal{N} = 2$ version furnishes the suitable set-up to address this last question and gravity/gauge theory correspondence in general.

Indeed, theories with 8 supercharges are specially interesting because this is the maximal supersymmetry that allows matter couplings with coupling functions that can continuously vary. The theory with 32 supercharges are completely fixed. There is only the supergravity multiplet that contains all other fields. The theory with 16 supercharges allow matter couplings. Here, there are discrete choices, essentially the number of multiplets that are included and possibly some signs related to compact or non-compact gauging. For 8 (and all lower numbers) of supercharges there are coupling functions that determine the manifold. These manifolds are not necessary symmetric spaces, and to determine the model, one has to specify certain functions. But the 8 supersymmetries impose a lot of structure on the couplings, and the remaining geometry leads to the concept of "special geometry".

An other aspect regarding the $\mathcal{N} = 2$, $d = 5$ gauged supergravity due to the presence of "less supersymmetry" is the following: if we consider the whole set of supergravity theories in diverse dimensions we discover an important general property. With the caveat of three noteworthy exceptions in all the other cases the constraints imposed by supersymmetry imply that the scalar manifold $\mathcal{M}_{scalar}$ is necessarily a homogeneous coset manifold $\mathcal{G}/\mathcal{H}$ of the non–compact type, namely a suitable non compact Lie group $\mathcal{G}$ modded by the action of a maximal compact subgroup $\mathcal{H} \subset \mathcal{G}$. By $\mathcal{M}_{scalar}$ we mean the manifold parametrized by the scalar fields ϕ^I present in the theory. The metric $g_{IJ}(\phi)$ defining the Riemannian structure of the scalar manifold appears in the supergravity lagrangian through the scalar kinetic term which is of the σ–model type:

$$\mathcal{L}^{kin}_{scalar} = \frac{1}{2}\, g_{IJ}(\phi)\, \partial_\mu \phi^I\, \partial^\mu \phi^J$$

The three noteworthy exceptions where the scalar manifold is allowed to be something more general than a coset $\mathcal{G}/\mathcal{H}$ are the following

1. $\mathcal{N} = 1$ supergravity in $d = 4$ where $\mathcal{M}_{scalar}$ is simply required to be a *Hodge Kähler manifold*.

2. $\mathcal{N} = 2$ supergravity in $d = 4$ where $\mathcal{M}_{scalar}$ is simply required to be the product of a *special Kähler manifold* $\mathcal{SK}_n$ containing the n_V complex scalars of the n_V vector multiplets with a *quaternionic manifold* $\mathcal{QM}_{n_H}$ containing the $4n_H$ real scalars of the n_H hypermultiplets. [2]

---

[1] Basic elements of these subjects are recalled in the appendix D.

[2] The notion of quaternionic geometry, as it enters the formulation of hypermultiplet coupling was introduced by Bagger and Witten in [8] and formalized by Galicki in [9] who also explored the relation with the notion of HyperKähler quotient, whose use in the construction of supersymmetric $\mathcal{N} = 2$ lagrangians had already been emphasized in [10]. The general problem of classifying quaternionic homogeneous spaces had been addressed in the mathematical literature by Alekseevski [11].

3. $\mathcal{N}=2$ supergravity in $d=5$ where $\mathcal{M}_{scalar}$ is simply required to be the product of a *very special manifold* $\mathcal{VS}_n$ [3] containing the n_V real scalars of the n_V vector multiplets with a *quaternionic manifold* $\mathcal{QM}_{n_H}$ containing the $4n_H$ real scalars of the n_H hypermultiplets.

However some families of homogeneous spaces exist and they are the ones usually considered in practical applications.[4]

In spite of the great number of works devoted to the study of BPS solutions (especially concerning models with vector multiplets only [18],[19]), interesting classes of solutions like black holes still remain to be analyzed in full generality. In particular, the addition of the hypermultiplets enriches the structure of the scalar manifold and increases the number of viable gauging. As a consequence of promoting the global R–symmetry group $SU(2)$ to a local symmetry, new terms enter in the potential enlarging the variety of admissible solutions. This happens, for example, for domain wall configurations as clearly explained in [20]. Although at least one hypermultiplet always appears in Calabi–Yau compactifications of M–theory [21], [22] solutions of this type are the only ones already studied in presence of hypermultiplets [23],[24],[17],[25],[26] apart from [27], [28].

My aim is to partially cover this lack, trying to extract from the analysis of special interesting cases (see chapter 2 and 3) some feature that hold also in general with the hope to obtain a "dictionary" of all possible solutions.

Very recently a great improvement to this program was given by Gauntlett et al. in [29] where they introduced a powerful method based on the group structure that characterizes supergravity models and that is applicable in different dimensions. Until now, it has been applied to the ungauged five and six dimensional $\mathcal{N}=2$ theory in [29] and [30], to the eleven dimensional supergravity [31] and to the minimal gauged ones with eight supercharges in $d=4$ and 5 respectively in [32] and [33].

My purpose, explicitly realized in chapter 4, is to extend the results of [33] to the theory with a generic number of hypermultiplets using together the informations deduced on the group structure of the base space and the analysis of hyperini variation[5] under supersymmetry.

Someone could express some doubts on the utility of classifying BPS solutions of gauged supergravity with matter in lower dimensions (than 11) arguing that all configurations of interest for string/M-theory are coded by the eleven dimensional supergravity hence it would seem a problem already solved in [31]. This impression is not true, in fact the same authors in [31] write "*the classification we are advocating would still leave the very challenging task of determining all of the explicit supersymmetric solutions that can arise within the classes we will discuss. For example,*

---

[3] The notion of very special geometry is essentially due to the work of Günaydin Sierra and Townsend who discovered it their work on coupling $d=5$ supergravity to vector multiplets [12, 13]. The notion was subsequently refined and properly related to special Kähler geometry in four dimensions through the work by de Wit and Van Proeyen [14, 15, 16].

[4] Recently non homogeneous manifold was used in the construction of the Randall-Sundrum scenario [17].

[5] In the following I refer to it simple as "hyperini equation".

in special case when the flux is zero, this corresponds to explicitly classifying all special holonomy manifolds, which seems to require fundamentally new mathematical ideas in order to make progress". Moreover no explicit knowledge of all possible compactifications down to a lower dimension exists.

So I think that it is not a mere exercise to address the problem for case $\mathcal{N} = 2$ in $d = 5$ in presence of matter multiplets. As I have already argued this case has a lot of possible applications and the comparison with eleven dimensional results could be fruitful to elucidate better the mathematical structure and put in evidence new features of low-energy limit of string/M theory. Furthermore this study could favor a supersymmetric realization of phenomenological models like the Randall-Sundrum scenario.

The plan of the thesis is the following: in the next chapter the basic elements of the theory are reviewed, putting the accent on its geometric properties that are impressed on the scalar manifold. Starting from the ungauged theory it is reported how the gauging procedure works in this case and which effects it has on the susy transformations and on the scalar potential. The role of the *moment map* is emphasized. The chapter ends with the presentation of the complete lagrangian and the supersymmetry variation of the fermions that are necessary to study BPS solutions. This concludes the introductory part of the thesis.

The chapter 2 is devoted to the study of electrostatic spherical symmetric solutions with an arbitrary number of hypermultiplets and it is mainly based on my article [28] with S. Cacciatori and my tutor D. Zanon. This particular class of configurations is relevant because it contains the Reissern–Nordström black hole. It is shown how, starting from a generic ansatz of such type, it is possible to derive (first order) BPS equations using the properties of the quaternionic geometry without specifying the scalar manifold[6] and explicitly choosing the gauge isometry, although the presence of a non zero graviphoton complicates the calculations a lot, with respect to the uncharged case. The form of the BPS equation for scalars is discussed and compared with the one obtained for a flat domain wall in [20]: the similarity suggests the existence of a general structure characterizing the hyperini equation which will be completely explained in the chapter 4. The above study is extended in chapter 3 to include vector multiplets, too [34]. The introduction of these matter fields is important not only because it allows us to consider gauge groups greater that $U(1)$, but also it is necessary to have solutions with two fixed points (like AdS black holes). The abelian case i.e. with gauge group $U(1)^{n_V+1}$ where n_V is the number of vector multiplet is analyzed. With the chapter 4 we enter in the most ambitious part of thesis. Here the problem of classifying BPS solutions in presence of a generic number of hypermultiplets is addressed. Two ingredients are fundamental in this effort: rewriting the BPS constraints on the killing spinor in term of bosonic quantities as first introduced in [29] and the analysis of hyperini equation. It is remarkable that this last result holds also in four dimensions the hyperini equation being identical; it should be possible without great trouble to extend the classification in $d = 4$ too. The configurations with a time–like killing spinor [7] are explicitly treated [35].

---

[6] This is important because our knowledge of the metric of the quaternionic manifolds is limited to few cases also for coset space.

I want to stress that the contributions presented in this work do not constitute the ultimate word on the subject, but are in fact a starting point: for example it remains to consider light–like killing spinors and to include vector multiplets. These and other remarks are pointed out in the conclusion. For the notations, which are in large part the same as [28], I refer the reader to the appendix.

---

[7] This is a short way to say that the vector $V_\mu = 1/2\bar{\epsilon}^i\gamma_\mu\epsilon_i$ constructed with the killing spinor is time–like.

Chapter 1

General elements of the theory

In this chapter I review the main features of gauged supergravity paying attention to the geometric structure of the theory that is a consequence of extended supersymmetry. After a general discussion on the subject, I will specialize to the case $\mathcal{N} = 2$ in five dimensions giving the explicit Lagrangian and the quantities of interest for the second part of the work. The aim here is not to give the exact procedure to construct a supergravity theory, a subject which would need more than one book for each one of the different methods existing.We only want to emphasize which are the basic considerations an explicit construction starts from, skipping technical details.

1.1 Introduction

Roughly speaking Supergravity is the gauged theory of supersymmetry, that is it describes systems which are left invariant by the action of local supersymmetric transformations on space–time. As a starting point we consider the (rigid) supersymmetry algebra: taking as example the $\mathcal{N} = 1$ case in four dimensions it is of the form

$$\begin{aligned}
[J_{\mu\nu}, J_{\rho\sigma}] &= 2\eta_{\rho[\nu}\delta^{\tau\lambda}_{\mu]\sigma}J_{\tau\lambda} \\
[J_{\mu\nu}, p_\rho] &= \eta_{\rho[\nu}p_{\mu]} \\
[J_{\mu\nu}, Q] &= \frac{1}{2}\gamma_{\mu\nu}Q \\
[p_\mu, p_\nu] &= 0 \\
[p_\mu, Q] &= 0 \\
\{Q, \bar{Q}\} &= \mathrm{i}\mathcal{C}\gamma^\mu p_\mu \qquad (1.1.1)
\end{aligned}$$

where $J_{\mu\nu}, p_\mu$ are the generators of the Poincaré algebra ($\mu = 0, 1, 2, 3$); γ_μ are a set of Dirac matrices satisfying the Clifford algebra

$$\{\gamma_\mu, \gamma_\nu\} = 2\eta_{\mu\nu};$$

$\gamma_{\mu\nu} \equiv \frac{1}{2}[\gamma_\mu, \gamma_\nu]$; $\mathcal{C}$ is the charge conjugation matrix satisfying

$$\mathcal{C}\gamma_\mu\mathcal{C}^{-1} = -\gamma_\mu^\dagger;$$

finally, the supercharge Q is a Majorana spinor, satisfying:

$$\bar{Q} \equiv Q^\dagger \gamma_0 = Q^t \mathcal{C}.$$

The supersymmetry generators Q act by turning bosonic degrees of freedom to fermionic ones, and viceversa. Note that, due to the presence of anticommutators, what (1.1.1) defines is not an algebra (as the Coleman–Mandula theorem states [36]) but an its generalization called superalgebra. As appears from the above relations considering supersymmetry, carried by the supercharge Q, as a local symmetry, implies considering also the translations p_μ as generators of local transformations, that is it involves *general covariance*. This is the reason for the name *supergravity*; it conciliates supersymmetry with general relativity.

From this consideration it is also clear that the construction of supergravity as a gauged theory of the SuperPoincarè group is not as straightforward as for general relativity. Indeed not all the "gauge fields" are independent, e.g. the spin connection w_μ^{ab} is a function of e_μ^a. Moreover general coordinate transformations should appear rather than local transformations. This means for examples that diffeomorphisms should replace local translations. In general relativity this is realized by the introduction of the constraint $De^a = 0$, implying that the metric $g_{\mu\nu} = e_\mu^a e_{\nu a}$ is torsionless. In the supergravity context this acquires the name of "conventional" constraint or supertorsion condition. Its exact form depends explicitly on the particular supergravity theory considered and the way to achieve it changes for the different methods.

However there are some consequences of constraints that are general and characterize each supergravity theory. First of all, together with the Bianchi identities, they impose the introduction of new terms in the curvatures that are necessary to the closure of the algebra. This can be summarized saying that *the algebra becomes soft* in the sense that its structure constants become structure functions. Furthermore the gravitini variation under supersymmetry takes the form of a covariant derivative operator acting on the local parameter of the transformation ϵ

$$\delta_\epsilon \psi = \mathcal{D}\epsilon \tag{1.1.2}$$

For the simple supergravity theory we have chosen as example $\mathcal{D}$ reduces to the ordinary covariant derivative of general relativity. If we consider extended supergravities and/or we introduce also matter, the situation changes. $\mathcal{D}$ will take additional contributions from the other fields of the theory.

As already mentioned before, the concrete construction of a supergravity theory is a hard task that requires the use of sophisticated techniques but always the starting point is given by the application of these general ideas on the field of the theory, which are organized in multiplets of rigid supersymmetry. The choice of these multiplets (weyl+matter) determines the degrees of freedom present in the theory.

In this chapter I will not discuss how to construct the $\mathcal{N} = 2$, $d = 5$ supergravity[1] but I will try to motivate (without an explicit demonstration) why this theory is how it is. In particular I will focus my attention on the surprisingly sophisticated geometric structure that characterizes the theory, first to stand on its feet at the ungauged level and, secondly, to be gauged producing non abelian symmetries and the scalar potential. Obviously all such structures are imposed on the theory by supersymmetry and the presence of the fermions. Yet since the fermions are ugly objects to deal with while their product, namely the geometric structure of the theory is beautiful, I will only stick to the latter and mention the fermions as seldom as possible. Indeed, because the subject of this thesis is the study of BPS solutions, in which the fermions are fixed to be zero, they enter only in the determination of the bosonic lagrangian and the BPS conditions. So let me start presenting the "bestiary" which characterizes the five dimensional supergravities.

---

[1] I refer the reader interested to these aspects to the book [37] and to great number of good

1.2 Supergravities in five dimension: an overview

I have already mentioned in the introductory chapter of the reasons for recent renewed interest in five–dimensional gauged supergravities. However this theory has a long and interesting history. The minimal theory ($\mathcal{N} = 2$), whose field content is given by the metric $g_{\mu\nu}$, a doublet of pseudo Majorana gravitinos $\psi_{i\mu}$ ($i = 1, 2$) and a vector boson A_μ was constructed twenty years ago [40] as the first non–trivial example of a rheonomic construction[2]. This simple model remains to the present day the unique example of a perfectly geometric theory where, notwithstanding the presence of a gauge boson A_μ, the action can be written solely in terms of differential forms and wedge products without introducing Hodge duals. This feature puts pure $d = 5$ supergravity into a selective club of few ideal theories whose other members are just pure gravity in arbitrary dimension and pure $\mathcal{N} = 1$ supergravity in four dimensions. The miracle that allows the boson A_μ to propagate without introducing its kinetic term is due to the conspiracy of the first order formalism for the spin connection ω^{ab} together with the presence of two Chern–Simons terms. The first Chern Simons term is the standard gauge one:

$$CS_{gauge} = F \wedge F \wedge A \tag{1.2.1}$$

while the second is a mixed, gravitational-gauge Chern Simons that reads as follows

$$CS_{mixed} = T^a \wedge F \wedge V_a \tag{1.2.2}$$

where V^a is the vielbein and $T^a = \mathcal{D}V^a$ is its *curvature*, namely the torsion.

The possible matter multiplets for $\mathcal{N} = 2, d = 5$ are the **vector/tensor** multiplets and the **hypermultiplets**. The field content of the first type of multiplets is

---

reviews and lectures like [38]. For the construction of theory with eight supercharges in four, five and six dimensions in the superconformal tensor calculus approach we suggest [39].

[2] We leave aside pure $\mathcal{N} = 1, d = 4$ supergravity that from the rheonomic viewpoint is a completely trivial case.

the following one:

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{llll} A^{\bar I}_\mu & & (\bar I = 1,\dots,n_V) & \text{vectors} \\ & \lambda^{\tilde x}_i \quad \phi^{\tilde x} & (\tilde x = 1,\dots,n_V + n_T \equiv n) & (i=1,2) \\ B^M_{\mu\nu} & & (M = 1,\dots,n_T) & \text{tensors} \end{array} \right\} \tag{1.2.3}$$

where by n_V I have denoted the number of vectors or gauge 1–forms $A^{\bar I}_\mu$, n_T being instead the number of tensors or gauge 2–forms $B^M_{\mu\nu} = -B^M_{\nu\mu}$. In ungauged supergravity, where everything is abelian, vectors and tensors are equivalent since they can be dualised into each other by means of the transformation:

$$\partial_{[\mu}\, A_{\nu]} = \epsilon_{\mu\nu}{}^{\lambda\rho\sigma}\, \partial_\lambda B_{\rho\sigma} \tag{1.2.4}$$

but in gauged supergravity it is only the 1–forms that can be promoted to non–abelian gauge vectors, while the 2–forms describe massive degrees of freedom. The other members of each vector/tensor multiplet are a doublet of pseudo Majorana spin 1/2 fields:

$$\lambda^{\tilde x}_i = \epsilon^{ij}\, \mathcal{C}\, \left(\overline{\lambda}^{j\tilde x}\right)^T \quad ; \quad \overline{\lambda}^{i\tilde x} = \left(\lambda^{\tilde x}_i\right)^\dagger \gamma_0 \quad ; \qquad i,j = 1,\dots,2\,. \tag{1.2.5}$$

and a real scalar $\phi^{\tilde x}$. The field content of hypermultiplets is the following:

$$\text{hypermultiplets} = \left\{ q^X\,(X = 1,\dots,4\,n_H)\,, \zeta^A\,(A = 1,\dots\, 2n_H) \right\} \tag{1.2.6}$$

where, having denoted n_H the number of hypermultiplets, q^X are n_H quadruplets of real scalar fields and ζ^A are n_H doublets of pseudo Majorana spin 1/2 fields:

$$\zeta^A = \mathbb{C}^{AB}\, \mathcal{C}\, \left(\overline{\zeta}_B\right)^T \quad ; \quad \overline{\zeta}_B = \left(\zeta^B\right)^\dagger \gamma_0 \quad ; \qquad A,B = 1,\dots,2\,n_H \tag{1.2.7}$$

the matrix $\mathbb{C}^T = -\mathbb{C}$, $\mathbb{C}^2 = -\mathbf{1}$ being the symplectic invariant metric of $\mathrm{Sp}(2m,\mathbb{R})$.

In the middle of the eighties, Gunaydin, Sierra and Townsend [12, 13] considered the general structure of $\mathcal{N} = 2, d = 5$ supergravity coupled to an arbitrary number $n = n_V + n_T$ of vector/tensor multiplets. They discovered that this is dictated by a peculiar geometric structure imposed by supersymmetry on the scalar manifold $\mathcal{SV}_n$ that contains the $\phi^{\tilde x}$ scalars. In modern nomenclature this peculiar geometry is named **very special geometry** and $\mathcal{SV}_n$ are referred to as real **very special manifolds**. The characterizing property of very special geometry arises from the need to reconcile the transformations of the scalar members of each multiplet with those of the vectors in presence of the Chern-Simons term (1.2.1), which generalizes to:

$$\mathcal{L}^{CS} = \frac{1}{6\sqrt{6}}\, C_{\tilde I \tilde J \tilde K} F^{\tilde I}_{\mu\nu}\, F^{\tilde J}_{\rho\sigma}\, A^{\tilde K}_\tau\, \epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma\tau} \tag{1.2.8}$$

the symbol $C_{\tilde I \tilde J \tilde K}$ denoting some appropriate constant symmetric tensor and, having dualised all 2–forms to vectors, the range of the indices $\tilde I$, $\tilde J$, $\tilde K$ being:

$$\tilde I = 1,\dots,n+1 \,=\, \left\{ \underbrace{0\,,\,\bar I}_{I},\,,\; M \right\} \tag{1.2.9}$$

Indeed, the total number of vector fields, including the graviphoton that belongs to the graviton multiplet, is always $n_V + 1$, n_V being the number of vector multiplets. It turns out that very special geometry is completely defined in terms of the constant tensors $C_{\tilde{I}\tilde{J}\tilde{K}}$, that are further restricted by a condition ensuring positivity of the energy. At the beginning of the nineties special manifolds were classified and thoroughly studied by de Wit, Van Proeyen and some other collaborators [14, 15, 16]. They also explored the dimensional reduction from $d = 5$ to $d = 4$, clarifying the way *real very special geometry* is mapped into the *special Kähler geometry* featured by vector multiplets in $d = 4$ and generically related to Calabi–Yau moduli spaces.

The $4n_H$ scalars of the hypermultiplet sector have instead exactly the same geometry in $d = 4$ as in $d = 5$ dimensions, namely they fill a quaternionic manifold $\mathcal{QM}$. These scalar geometries are a crucial ingredient in the construction of both the ungauged and the gauged supergravity lagrangians. Indeed, the basic operations involved by the gauging procedure are based on the specific geometric structures of very special and quaternionic manifolds, in particular the crucial existence of a moment–map (see sect.1.4.1). For this reason the present section is devoted to a summary of these geometries and to an illustration of the general form of the bosonic $d = 5$ lagrangians.

Independently from the number of supersymmetries we can write a general form for the bosonic action of any $d = 5$ *ungauged supergravity*, namely the following one:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}^{(ungauged)}_{(d=5)} &= \sqrt{-g}\left(\frac{1}{2}R - \frac{1}{4}a_{\tilde{I}\tilde{J}}F^{\tilde{I}}_{\mu\nu}F^{\tilde{J}|\mu\nu} + \frac{1}{2}g_{\Lambda\Sigma}\,\partial_\mu\varphi^\Lambda\,\partial^\mu\,\varphi^\Sigma\right)\\ &\quad + \frac{1}{6\sqrt{6}}C_{\tilde{I}\tilde{J}\tilde{K}}\,\epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma\tau}\,F^{\tilde{I}}_{\mu\nu}\,F^{\tilde{J}}_{\rho\sigma}\,A^{\tilde{K}}_\tau \end{aligned} \tag{1.2.10}$$

where $g_{\Lambda\Sigma}$ is the metric of the scalar manifold $\mathcal{M}_{scalar}$, $a_{\tilde{I}\tilde{J}}(\varphi)$ is a positive definite symmetric function of the scalars that under the isometry group $\mathcal{G}_{iso}$ of $\mathcal{M}_{scalar}$ transforms in $\bigotimes^2_{sym}\mathbf{R}$, having denoted by $\mathbf{R}$ a linear representation of $\mathcal{G}_{iso}$ to which the vector fields A^Γ are assigned. Finally $C_{\tilde{I}\tilde{J}\tilde{K}}$ is a three–index symmetric tensor invariant with respect to the representation $\mathbf{R}$.

To see how the same items are realized in the case of an $\mathcal{N} = 2$ theory we have to introduce very special and quaternionic geometry. Before we elaborate this, it is worth nothing that also the supersymmetry transformation rule of the gravitino field admits a general form (once restricted to the purely bosonic terms), namely:

$$\delta\psi_{i\mu} = \mathcal{D}_\mu\,\epsilon_i + i\frac{1}{4\sqrt{6}}\,\mathcal{T}^{\rho\sigma}_{ij}\,(4g_{\mu\rho}\,\gamma_\sigma - \gamma_{\mu\rho\sigma})\,\epsilon^j \tag{1.2.11}$$

where the indices i, j run in the fundamental representation of the automorphism (R-symmetry) group USp($\mathcal{N}$) and the tensor $\mathcal{T}^{\rho\sigma}_{ij}$, antisymmetric both in ij and in $\rho\sigma$ and named the graviphoton field strength, is given by:

$$\mathcal{T}^{\rho\sigma}_{ij} = \Phi^{\tilde{I}}_{ij}(\phi)\,a_{\tilde{I}\tilde{J}}F^{\tilde{J}|\rho\sigma} \tag{1.2.12}$$

the scalar field dependent tensor $\Phi^{\tilde{I}}_{ij}(\phi)$ being intrinsically defined as the coefficient of the term $\bar{\epsilon}^i\,\psi^j_\mu$ in the supersymmetry transformation rule of the vector field $A^{\tilde{I}}_\mu$, namely:

$$\delta A^{\tilde I}_\mu = \cdots - \frac{\sqrt{6}}{4}\mathrm{i}\,\Phi^{\tilde I}_{ij}(\phi)\,\bar\psi^i_\mu\,\epsilon^j \tag{1.2.13}$$

From its own definition it follows that under isometries of the scalar manifold $\Phi^{\tilde I}_{ij}(\phi)$ must transform in the representation $\mathbf{R}$ of $\mathcal{G}_{iso}$ times $\bigwedge^2 \mathcal{N}$ of the R-symmetry USp($\mathcal{N}$). We see in the next subsection how this is generally realized in an $\mathcal{N} = 2$ theory via very special geometry.

1.2.1 Very special geometry

Very special geometry is the peculiar metric and associated Riemannian structure that can be constructed on a very special manifold. By definition a *very special manifold* $\mathcal{VS}_n$ is a real manifold of dimension n that can be represented as the following algebraic locus in $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$:

$$1 = \mathrm{N}(h) \equiv \left(C_{\tilde I\tilde J\tilde K}\,h^{\tilde I}\,h^{\tilde J}\,h^{\tilde K}\right)^{\frac{1}{3}} \tag{1.2.14}$$

where $h^{\tilde I}$ $(\tilde I = 1, \dots, n+1)$ are the coordinates of $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ while

$$C_{\tilde I\tilde J\tilde K} \tag{1.2.15}$$

is a **constant symmetric tensor** fulfilling some additional defining properties that I will recall later on.
A coordinate system $\phi^{\tilde x}$ on $\mathcal{VS}_n$ is provided by any parametric solution of eq. (1.2.14) such that:

$$h^{\tilde I} = h^{\tilde I}(\phi) \quad ; \quad \phi^{\tilde x} = \text{free} \quad ; \quad \tilde x = 1, \dots, n \tag{1.2.16}$$

The *very special metric* on the very special manifold is nothing else but the pull–back on the algebraic surface (1.2.14) of the following $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ metric:

$$\begin{aligned} ds^2_{\mathbb{R}^{n+1}} &= a_{\tilde I\tilde J}\,dh^{\tilde I}\otimes dh^{\tilde J} && (1.2.17)\\ a_{\tilde I\tilde J} &\equiv -\partial_{\tilde I}\partial_{\tilde J}\,\ln\mathrm{N}(X) && (1.2.18)\end{aligned}$$

In other words, in any coordinate frame the coefficients of the very special metric are the following ones:

$$g_{\tilde x\tilde y}(\phi) = a_{\tilde I\tilde J}\,h^{\tilde I}_{\tilde x}\,h^{\tilde J}_{\tilde y} \tag{1.2.19}$$

where we have introduced the new objects:

$$h^{\tilde I}_{\tilde x} \equiv -\sqrt{\frac{3}{2}}\partial_{\tilde x}h^{\tilde I} = -\sqrt{\frac{3}{2}}\frac{\partial}{\partial\phi^{\tilde x}}h^{\tilde I} \tag{1.2.20}$$

If we also define

$$h_{\tilde I} = \frac{\partial}{\partial h^{\tilde I}}\ \ln\mathrm{N(X)} \quad ; \quad h_{\tilde I\tilde x} \equiv \sqrt{\frac{3}{2}}\partial_{\tilde x}h_{\tilde I} \tag{1.2.21}$$

and introduce the $2(n+1)$-vectors:

$$U = \begin{pmatrix} h^{\tilde{I}} \\ h_{\tilde{I}} \end{pmatrix} \quad ; \quad U_{\tilde{x}} = \partial_{\tilde{x}} U = \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}} \begin{pmatrix} -h^{\tilde{I}}_{\tilde{x}} \\ h_{\tilde{I}\tilde{x}} \end{pmatrix} \tag{1.2.22}$$

it can be shown that taking a second covariant derivative the following identity is true:

$$\nabla_{\tilde{x}} U_{\tilde{y}} = \frac{2}{3}\, g_{\tilde{x}\tilde{y}} U + \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}\, T_{\tilde{x}\tilde{y}\tilde{z}}\, g^{\tilde{z}\tilde{w}}\, U_{\tilde{w}} \tag{1.2.23}$$

where the world–index symmetric coordinate dependent tensor $T_{\tilde{x}\tilde{y}\tilde{z}}$ is related to the constant tensor $C_{\tilde{I}\tilde{J}\tilde{K}}$ by:

$$C_{\tilde{I}\tilde{J}\tilde{K}} = \frac{5}{2}\, h_{\tilde{I}}\, h_{\tilde{J}}\, h_{\tilde{K}} - \frac{3}{2}\, a_{(\tilde{I}\tilde{J}}\, h_{\tilde{K})} + T_{\tilde{x}\tilde{y}\tilde{z}}\, h^{\tilde{x}}_{\tilde{I}}\, h^{\tilde{y}}_{\tilde{J}}\, h^{\tilde{z}}_{\tilde{K}} \tag{1.2.24}$$

The identity (1.2.23) is the real counterpart of a completely similar identity that holds true in special Kähler geometry and also defines a symmetric 3–index tensor. In the use of very special geometry to construct a supersymmetric field theory the essential property is the existence of the *section* $h^{\tilde{I}}(\phi)$. Indeed it is this object that allows the writing of the tensor $\Phi^{\Lambda}_{AB}(\phi)$ appearing in the vector transformation rule (1.2.13). It is sufficient to set:

$$\Phi^{\tilde{I}}_{ij}(\phi) = h^{\tilde{I}}(\phi)\, \epsilon_{ij} \tag{1.2.25}$$

Why do we call it a section? Since it is just a section of a **flat vector bundle** of rank $n+1$

$$\mathrm{FB} \xrightarrow{\pi} \mathcal{SV}_n \tag{1.2.26}$$

with base manifold the very special manifold and structural group some subgroup of the $n+1$ dimensional linear group: $\mathcal{G}_{iso} \subset \mathrm{GL}(n+1, \mathbb{R})$. The bundle is flat because the transition functions from one local trivialization to another are constant matrices:

$$\forall g \in \mathcal{G}_{iso} \quad : \quad h^{\tilde{I}}(g\,\phi) = (M[g])^{\tilde{I}}{}_{\tilde{J}}\; h^{\tilde{J}}(\phi) \quad ; \quad M[g] = \text{constant matrix} \tag{1.2.27}$$

The structural group $\mathcal{G}_{iso}$ is implicitly defined as the set of matrices M that leave the $C_{\tilde{I}\tilde{J}\tilde{K}}$ tensor invariant:

$$M \in \mathcal{G}_{iso} \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad M_{\tilde{I}_1}{}^{\tilde{J}_1}\, M_{\tilde{I}_2}{}^{\tilde{J}_2}\, M_{\tilde{I}_3}{}^{\tilde{J}_3}\, C_{\tilde{I}_1\tilde{I}_2\tilde{I}_3} = C_{\tilde{J}_1\tilde{J}_2\tilde{J}_3} \tag{1.2.28}$$

Since the very special metric is defined by eq. (1.2.19), it immediately follows that $\mathcal{G}_{iso}$ is a subgroup of the isometry group of such a metric,[3] its action in any coordinate patch (1.2.16) being defined by the action (1.2.27) on the section $h^{\tilde{I}}$. This fact explains the name given to this group.

---

[3] All the non linearly realized isometries of metric are not into $\mathcal{G}_{iso}$: explicit examples of spaces with this type of isometries exist.

By this reasoning I have shown that the classification of very special manifolds is partially reduced to the classification of the constant tensors $C_{\tilde{I}\tilde{J}\tilde{K}}$ such that their group of invariances acts transitively on the manifold $\mathcal{SV}_n$ defined by eq. (1.2.14) and that the special metric (1.2.19) is positive definite. This is the algebraic problem that was completely solved by de Wit and Van Proeyen in [14]. They found all such tensors and the corresponding manifolds. There is a large subclass of very special manifolds that are homogeneous spaces but there are also infinite families of manifolds that are not $\mathcal{G}/\mathcal{H}$ cosets.

1.2.2 Quaternionic Geometry

Next I turn my attention to the hypermultiplet sector of an $\mathcal{N}=2$ supergravity. For these multiplets no distinction arises between $d=4$ and $d=5$. Each hypermultiplet contains 4 real scalar fields and, at least locally, they can be regarded as the four components of a quaternion. The locality caveat is, in this case, very substantial because global quaternionic coordinates can be constructed only occasionally, even on those manifolds that are denominated quaternionic in the mathematical literature [11], [9]. Anyhow, what is important is that, in the hypermultiplet sector, the dimension of the scalar manifold $\mathcal{QM}$ is a multiple of four:

$$\dim_{\mathbf{R}} \mathcal{QM} \;=\; 4\, n_H \;\equiv\; 4\,\#\,\text{of hypermultiplets} \tag{1.2.29}$$

and, in some appropriate sense, it has a quaternionic structure.

The geometry of the hypermultiplet sector is called*Hypergeometry*, irrespectively whether we deal with global or local $\mathcal{N}=2$ theories. Yet there are two kinds of hypergeometries. Supersymmetry requires the existence of a principal SU(2)–bundle

$$\mathcal{SU} \longrightarrow \mathcal{QM} \tag{1.2.30}$$

The bundle $\mathcal{SU}$ is **flat** in the *rigid supersymmetry case* while its curvature is proportional to the Kähler forms in the *local case*.

These two versions of hypergeometry were already known in mathematics prior to their use [41], [42], [43], [44], [45] in the context of $\mathcal{N}=2$ supersymmetry and are identified as:

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \text{rigid hypergeometry} & \equiv & \text{HyperKähler geometry.} \\ \text{local hypergeometry} & \equiv & \text{quaternionic geometry} \end{array} \tag{1.2.31}$$

Quaternionic versus HyperKähler manifolds

Both a quaternionic and a HyperKähler manifold $\mathcal{QM}$ are a $4n_H$-dimensional real manifold endowed with a metric g:

$$ds^2 = g_{XY}(q)dq^X \otimes dq^Y \quad ; \quad X,Y = 1,\ldots,4n_H \tag{1.2.32}$$

and three complex structures

$$(J^r) \;:\; T(\mathcal{QM}) \longrightarrow T(\mathcal{QM}) \qquad (r=1,2,3) \tag{1.2.33}$$

that satisfy the quaternionic algebra

$$J^r J^s = -\delta^{rs}\,\mathbb{1} + \epsilon^{rs}{}_t J^t \tag{1.2.34}$$

and with respect to which the metric is hermitian:

$$\forall \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y} \in T\mathcal{QM} : \quad g\left(J^r\mathbf{X}, J^r\mathbf{Y}\right) = g\left(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}\right) \qquad (r = 1, 2, 3) \tag{1.2.35}$$

From eq. (1.2.35) it follows that one can introduce a triplet of 2-forms

$$K^r \;=\; K^r_{XY} dq^X \wedge dq^Y \quad ; \quad K^r_{XY} \;=\; g_{XZ}(J^r)^Z_Y \tag{1.2.36}$$

that provides the generalization of the concept of Kähler form occurring in the complex case. The triplet K^r is named the *HyperKähler* form. It is an SU(2) Lie–algebra valued 2–form in the same way as the Kähler form is a $U(1)$ Lie–algebra valued 2–form. In the complex case the definition of a Kähler manifold involves the statement that the Kähler 2–form is closed. At the same time in Hodge–Kähler manifolds (those appropriate to local supersymmetry in $d = 4$) the Kähler 2–form can be identified with the curvature of a line–bundle which in the case of rigid supersymmetry is flat. Similar steps can be taken also here and lead to two possibilities: either HyperKähler or quaternionic manifolds.

Let us introduce a principal SU(2)–bundle $\mathcal{SU}$ as defined in eq. (1.2.30). Let p^r denote a connection on such a bundle. To obtain either a HyperKähler or a quaternionic manifold we must impose the condition that the HyperKähler 2–form is covariantly closed with respect to the connection p^r:

$$\nabla K^r \equiv dK^r + 2\epsilon^r{}_{st} p^s \wedge K^t \;=\; 0 \tag{1.2.37}$$

The only difference between the two kinds of geometries resides in the structure of the $\mathcal{SU}$–bundle.

Definition 1.2.1 *A HyperKähler manifold is a* $4n_H$*–dimensional manifold with the structure described above and such that the* $\mathcal{SU}$*–bundle is* **flat**

Defining the $\mathcal{SU}$–curvature by:

$$R^r \;\equiv\; dp^r + 2\epsilon^r{}_{st} p^s \wedge p^t \tag{1.2.38}$$

in the HyperKähler case we have:

$$R^r \;=\; 0 \tag{1.2.39}$$

Viceversa,

Definition 1.2.2 *A quaternionic manifold is a* $4n_H$*–dimensional manifold with the structure described above and such that the curvature of the* $\mathcal{SU}$*–bundle is proportional to the HyperKähler 2–form*

Hence, in the quaternionic case we can write:

$$R^r \,=\, \lambda \, K^x \tag{1.2.40}$$

where λ is a non vanishing real number.[4]

As a consequence of the above structure the manifold $\mathcal{QM}$ has a holonomy group of the following type:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{Hol}(\mathcal{QM}) &= \mathrm{SU}(2) \otimes \mathcal{H} \quad \text{(quaternionic)} \\ \mathrm{Hol}(\mathcal{QM}) &= \mathbb{1} \otimes \mathcal{H} \quad \text{(HyperKähler)} \\ \mathcal{H} &\subset Sp(2n_H, \mathbb{R}) \end{aligned} \tag{1.2.41}$$

In both cases, introducing flat indices $\{i, j, k = 1, 2\}\{A, B, C = 1, .., 2n_H\}$ that run , in the fundamental representations of, respectively, SU(2) and Sp($2n_H, \mathbb{R}$), we can find a vielbein 1-form

$$f^{iA} = f^{iA}_X(q) dq^X \tag{1.2.42}$$

such that

$$g_{XY} = f^{iA}_X f^{jB}_Y \mathbb{C}_{AB} \epsilon_{ij} \tag{1.2.43}$$

where $\mathbb{C}_{AB} = -\mathbb{C}_{BA}$ and $\epsilon_{ij} = -\epsilon_{ji}$ are, respectively, the flat Sp($2n_H$) and Sp(2) $\sim$ SU(2) invariant metrics. The vielbein f^{iA} is covariantly closed with respect to the SU(2)-connection p^r and to some Sp($2n_H, \mathbb{R}$)-Lie Algebra valued connection $\Delta^{AB} = \Delta^{BA}$:

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla f^{iA} &\equiv df^{iA} + i p^r (\epsilon \sigma_r \epsilon^{-1})^i{}_j \wedge f^{jA} \\ &+ \Delta^{AB} \wedge f^{iD} \mathbb{C}_{BD} = 0 \end{aligned} \tag{1.2.44}$$

where $(\sigma^r)_i{}^j$ are the standard Pauli matrices. Furthermore f^{iA} satisfies the reality condition:

$$f_{iA} \equiv (f^{iA})^* = \epsilon_{ij} \mathbb{C}_{AB} f^{jB} \tag{1.2.45}$$

Eq. (1.2.45) defines the rule to lower the symplectic indices by means of the flat symplectic metrics ϵ_{ij} and $\mathbb{C}_{AB}$. More specifically we can write a stronger version of eq. (1.2.43) [8]:

$$(f^{iA}_X f^{jB}_Y + f^{iA}_Y f^{jB}_X) \mathbb{C}_{AB} \;=\; g_{XY} \epsilon^{ij} \tag{1.2.46}$$

We have also the inverse vielbein f^X_{iA} defined by the equation

$$f^X_{iA} f^{iA}_Y = \delta^X_Y \tag{1.2.47}$$

Flattening a pair of indices of the Riemann tensor $\mathcal{R}^{XY}{}_{ZW}$ we obtain

$$\mathcal{R}^{XY}{}_{ZW} f^{iA}_X f^{jB}_Y = -\, i R^r_{ZW} \epsilon^{ik} (\sigma_r)_k{}^j \mathbb{C}^{AB} + \mathbb{R}^{AB}_{ZW} \epsilon^{ij} \tag{1.2.48}$$

---

[4] In my notation λ is equal to $\frac{1}{2}$.

where $\mathbb{R}^{AB}_{ZW}$ is the field strength of the Sp$(2n_H)$ connection:

$$d\Delta^{AB} + \Delta^{AC} \wedge \Delta^{DB} \mathbb{C}_{CD} \equiv \mathbb{R}^{AB} = \mathbb{R}^{AB}_{ZW} dq^Z \wedge dq^W \tag{1.2.49}$$

Eq. (1.2.48) is the explicit statement that the Levi Civita connection associated with the metric g has a holonomy group contained in SU(2) $\otimes$ Sp$(2n_H)$. Consider now eq.s (1.2.34), (1.2.36) and (1.2.40). We easily deduce the following relation:

$$g^{ZW} K^r_{XZ} K^s_{ZY} = -\delta^{rs} g_{XY} + \epsilon^{rs}{}_t K^t_{XY} \tag{1.2.50}$$

that holds true both in the HyperKähler and in the quaternionic case. In the latter case, using eq. (1.2.40), eq. (1.2.50) can be rewritten as follows:

$$g^{ZW} R^r_{XZ} R^s_{ZY} = -\lambda^2 \delta^{rs} g_{XY} + \lambda \epsilon^{rs}{}_t R^t_{XY} \tag{1.2.51}$$

Eq. (1.2.51) implies that the intrinsic components of the curvature 2-form R^r yield a representation of the quaternion algebra. In the HyperKähler case such a representation is provided only by the HyperKähler form. In the quaternionic case we can write:

$$R^r_{iA,jB} \equiv R^r_{XY} f^X_{iA} f^Y_{jB} = -i\lambda \mathbb{C}_{AB} (\sigma_r)_i{}^k \epsilon_{kj} \tag{1.2.52}$$

Alternatively eq. (1.2.52) can be rewritten in an intrinsic form as

$$R^r = -\mathrm{i}\, \lambda \mathbb{C}_{AB} (\sigma_r)_i{}^k \epsilon_{kj} f^{iA} \wedge f^{jB} \tag{1.2.53}$$

whence we also get:

$$\frac{i}{2} R^r (\sigma_r)_i{}^j = \lambda f_{iA} \wedge f^{jA} \tag{1.2.54}$$

The quaternionic manifolds are not requested to be homogeneous spaces, however there exists a subclass of quaternionic homogeneous spaces that are displayed in Table 1.1.

1.2.3 $\mathcal{N} = 2$, $d = 5$ supergravity before gauging

Relying on the geometric lore developed in the previous sections it is now easy to state what is the bosonic Lagrangian of a general $\mathcal{N} = 2$ theory in five–dimensions. We just have to choose an n–dimensional very special manifold and some quaternionic manifold $\mathcal{QM}$ of quaternionic dimension n_H. Then recalling eq. (1.2.10) we can specialize it to:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\sqrt{-g}} \mathcal{L}^{(ungauged)}_{(d=5,\mathcal{N}=2)} \quad = \quad & \frac{1}{2} R - \frac{1}{4} a_{\tilde{I}\tilde{J}}(\phi) F^{\tilde{I}}_{\mu\nu} F^{\tilde{J}|\mu\nu} + \frac{1}{2} g_{\tilde{x}\tilde{y}}(\phi)\, \partial_\mu \phi^{\tilde{x}}\, \partial^\mu \phi^{\tilde{y}} \\ & + \frac{1}{2} g_{XY}(q)\, \partial_\mu q^X\, \partial^\mu q^Y + \frac{1}{6\sqrt{6}\sqrt{-g}} C_{\tilde{I}\tilde{J}\tilde{K}}\, \epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma\tau}\, F^{\tilde{I}}_{\mu\nu}\, F^{\tilde{J}}_{\rho\sigma}\, A^{\tilde{K}}_\tau \end{aligned} \tag{1.2.55}$$

where $g_{XY}(q)$ is the quaternionic metric on the quaternionic manifold $\mathcal{QM}$, while $g_{\tilde{x}\tilde{y}}(\phi)$ is the very special metric on the very special manifold. At the same time,

Table 1.1: *Homogeneous symmetric quaternionic manifolds*

n_H	G/H
m	$\frac{\mathrm{Sp}(2m+2)}{\mathrm{Sp}(2)\times\mathrm{Sp}(2m)}$
m	$\frac{\mathrm{SU}(m,2)}{SU(m)\times\mathrm{SU}(2)\times U(1)}$
m	$\frac{\mathrm{SO}(4,m)}{\mathrm{SO}(4)\times\mathrm{SO}(m)}$
2	$\frac{G_2}{\mathrm{SO}(4)}$
7	$\frac{F_4}{\mathrm{Sp}(6)\times\mathrm{Sp}(2)}$
10	$\frac{E_6}{\mathrm{SU}(6)\times U(1)}$
16	$\frac{E_7}{S0(12)\times\mathrm{SU}(2)}$
28	$\frac{E_8}{E_7\times\mathrm{SU}(2)}$

the constant tensor $C_{\tilde{I}\tilde{J}\tilde{K}}$ is that defining the cubic norm (1.2.14) while the kinetic metric a is that defined in eq. (1.2.18). The transformation rule of the gravitino field takes the general form (1.2.11) with the graviphoton defined as in eq. (1.2.12) and the tensor $\Phi^{\tilde{I}}_{ij}$ given by eq. (1.2.25). In this respect it is noteworthy that the gravitino supersymmetry transformation rule depends only on the vector multiplet scalars and it is independent of the hypermultiplets. Such a situation will be changed by the gauging, that introduces a gravitino mass-matrix depending also on the hypermultiplets.

1.3 Supergravity Gaugings

Before entering in the technical details of the gauging procedure for our specific case let me begin by recalling some very general aspects which are common to extended supergravities in different dimensions. Because of the fundamental property that the scalar potential is generated by the gauging, the discussion on these topics naturally involves spontaneous supersymmetry breaking and the super-Higgs mechanism. [5]

1.3.1 Supersymmetry breaking in conventional vacua

A conventional[6] vacuum of d–dimensional supergravity corresponds to a space–time geometry with a maximally extended group of isometries, namely with $\frac{1}{2}d(d+1)$ Killing vectors. This means that the metric $ds^2 = g_{\mu\nu}dx^\mu \otimes dx^\nu$ necessarily has constant curvature in d–dimensions and is one of the following three:

$$\mathcal{M}_{space-time} = \left\{ \begin{array}{lcl} AdS_d & ; & \text{negative curvature} \\ \text{Minkowski}_\text{d} & ; & \text{zero curvature} \\ \text{dS}_\text{d} & ; & \text{positive curvature} \end{array} \right. \tag{1.3.1}$$

At the same time, in order to be consistent with this maximal symmetry, the v.e.v.s of the scalar fields, $<\varphi^\Lambda>=\varphi^\Lambda_0$, must be constant and be extrema of the scalar potential:

$$\left.\frac{\partial \mathcal{V}}{\partial \varphi^\Lambda}\right|_{\varphi=\varphi_0} = 0 \; , \tag{1.3.2}$$

Minkowski space occurs when $\mathcal{V}(\varphi_0) = 0$, anti de Sitter space AdS$_d$ occurs when $\mathcal{V}(\varphi_0) < 0$ and finally de Sitter space dS$_d$ is generated by $\mathcal{V}(\varphi_0) > 0$. To be definite, I focus on the 4–dimensional case, that also historically was the first to be analyzed, but all the mechanisms and properties I describe below have straightforward counterparts in higher dimensions. Furthermore, as already underlined before, it presents a lot of similarities with the 5–dimensional case. So let me state that in relation with the super-Higgs mechanism, there are just three relevant items of the entire $d = 4$ supergravity construction that have to be considered:

---

[5] They were codified in the literature of the early and middle eighties [46, 47, 48, 49] (for a review see chapter II.8 of [37]) and were further analyzed and extended in the middle nineties [50, 51, 52, 53].

[6] I use the term "conventional" to distinguish them from the ones obtainable from Domain wall configurations (see Appendix D).

1. The *gravitino mass matrix* $S_{ij}(\varphi)$, namely the non-derivative scalar field dependent term that appears in the gravitino supersymmetry transformation rule:
$$\delta\psi_{i|\mu} = \mathcal{D}_\mu\,\epsilon_i \,+\, S_{ij}\,(\varphi)\;\gamma_\mu\,\epsilon^j \;+\ldots, \tag{1.3.3}$$
and reappears as a mass term in the Lagrangian:
$$\mathcal{L}^{\mathrm{SUGRA}} \;=\; \ldots + \text{const}\,\left(\,S_{ij}(\varphi)\,\psi^i_\mu\,\gamma^{\mu\nu}\,\psi^j_\nu \,+\, S^{ij}(\varphi)\,\psi_{i|\mu}\,\gamma^{\mu\nu}\,\psi_{j|\nu}\,\right) \tag{1.3.4}$$

2. The *fermion shifts*, namely the non-derivative scalar field dependent terms in the supersymmetry transformation rule of the spin $\frac{1}{2}$ fields :
$$\begin{aligned}\delta\,\lambda^\Lambda_R &= \text{derivative terms} \,+\, \Sigma_i{}^\Lambda\,(\varphi)\;\epsilon^i\;,\\ \delta\,\lambda^\Lambda_L &= \text{derivative terms} \,+\, \Sigma^{i|\Lambda}\,(\varphi)\;\epsilon_i\;.\end{aligned} \tag{1.3.5}$$

3. The scalar potential itself, $\mathcal{V}(\varphi)$.

These three items are related by a general supersymmetry Ward identity, firstly discovered in the context of gauged $\mathcal{N} = 8$ supergravity [54] and later extended to all supergravities [46, 48, 49], that, in my conventions,[7] reads as follows:
$$6\,S_{ik}\,S^{kj} - 4\,K_{\Lambda,\Gamma}\Sigma_i{}^\Lambda\Sigma^{j|\Gamma} \;=\; -\delta^j_i\,\mathcal{V}\;, \tag{1.3.6}$$
where $K_{\Lambda,\Gamma}$ is the kinetic matrix of the spin–1/2 fermions [47, 55, 56, 57]. The numerical coefficients appearing in (1.3.6) depend on the normalization of the kinetic terms of the fermions, while $i, j, \cdots = 1, \ldots, \mathcal{N}$ are SU($\mathcal{N}$) indices that enumerate the supersymmetry charges. We also follow the standard convention that the upper or lower position of such indices denotes definite chiral projections of Majorana spinors, right or left depending on the species of fermions considered[8]. The position denotes also the way of transforming of the fermion with respect to SU($\mathcal{N}$), with lower indices in the fundamental and upper indices in the fundamental bar. In this way we have $S^{ij} = (S_{ij})^\star$ and $\Sigma_i{}^\Lambda = \left(\Sigma^{j|\Lambda}\right)^\star$. Finally, the index Λ is a collective index that enumerates all spin–1/2 fermions λ^Λ present in the theory[9].

The corresponding fermion shifts are defined by
$$\delta\,\lambda^\Lambda \;=\; \text{derivative terms} \,+\, \Sigma_i{}^\Lambda\,(\varphi)\;\epsilon^i\;. \tag{1.3.7}$$

A vacuum configuration φ_0 that preserves $\mathcal{N}_0$ supersymmetries is characterized by the existence of $\mathcal{N}_0$ vectors $\rho^i_{(\ell)}$ $(\ell = 1, \ldots, \mathcal{N}_0)$ of SU($\mathcal{N}$), such that
$$\begin{aligned}S_{ij}\,(\varphi_0)\;\rho^i_{(\ell)} &= e^{\mathrm{i}\theta}\sqrt{\tfrac{-\mathcal{V}(\varphi_0)}{6}}\,\rho_{i(\ell)}\;,\\ \Sigma_i{}^\Lambda\,(\varphi_0)\;\rho^i_{(\ell)} &= 0\;,\end{aligned} \tag{1.3.8}$$

---

[7] In fact I adopt the conventions of $d = 5$ to avoid any confusion with the normalization and the role of the indices.

[8] For instance, we have $\gamma_5\,\epsilon_i = \epsilon_i$ and $\gamma_5\,\epsilon^i = -\epsilon^i$.

[9] We denote by λ^Λ the right handed chiral projection while λ_Λ are the left handed ones.

where θ is an irrelevant phase. Indeed, consider the spinor

$$\epsilon^i(x) = \sum_{\ell=1}^{\mathcal{N}_0} \rho^i_{(\ell)} \epsilon^{(\ell)}(x) \ , \tag{1.3.9}$$

where $\epsilon^{(\ell)}(x)$ are $\mathcal{N}_0$ independent solutions of the equation for covariantly constant spinors in AdS$_4$ (or Minkowski space) with $2\,e = \sqrt{-\mathcal{V}(\varphi_0)/6}$:

$$D_a^{(\mathrm{AdS})}\epsilon(x) \equiv (\partial_a - \frac{1}{4}\omega^{bc}{}_a\gamma_{bc} - 2\,e\,\gamma_5\gamma_a)\epsilon(x) = 0 \ , \tag{1.3.10}$$

The integrability of eq. (1.3.10) is guaranteed by the expression of the AdS$_4$ curvature, $R^{ab}{}_{cd} = -64\,e^2\,\delta^{ab}_{cd}$, that corresponds to the Ricci tensor:

$$\mathcal{R}_{ab} = -96\,e^2\,\eta_{ab} \ = \ \mathcal{V}(\varphi_0)\,\eta_{ab}, \tag{1.3.11}$$

Then it follows that under supersymmetry transformations of the parameter (1.3.9), the chosen vacuum configuration $\varphi = \varphi_0$ is invariant[10]. That such a configuration is a true vacuum follows from another property proved, for instance, in [49]: all vacua that admit at least one vector ρ^i satisfying eq. (1.3.8) are automatically extrema of the potential, namely they satisfy eq. (1.3.2). Furthermore, as one can immediately check, the four dimensional action for constant scalar field configurations implies that the Ricci tensor must be $\mathcal{R}_{\mu\nu} = \mathcal{V}(\varphi_0)\,g_{\mu\nu}$, as in equation (1.3.11).

The above integrability argument can be easily generalized to all dimensions and to all numbers of supersymmetries $\mathcal{N}$. Consider a supergravity action in d dimensions that, once reduced to the gravitational plus scalar field sector, has this general form:

$$A^{[d]}_{grav+scal} = \int d^dx\,\sqrt{-g}\,\frac{1}{2}\left[\,R[g] + \alpha\,g_{\Lambda\Sigma}(\varphi)\,\partial^\mu\,\varphi^\Lambda\partial_\mu\varphi^\Lambda - 2\mathcal{V}(\varphi)\right] \tag{1.3.12}$$

where α is a normalization constant that can vary from case to case, since it can always be reabsorbed into the definition of the scalar metric. But the scalar potential $\mathcal{V}$ has an unambiguous and unique normalization with respect to the Einstein term. For constant field configurations φ_0, the Einstein equations derived from (1.3.12) imply that:

$$R_{\mu\nu} = \frac{2}{(d-2)}\,\mathcal{V}(\varphi_0)\,g_{\mu\nu} \tag{1.3.13}$$

Then the Riemann tensor of an anti de Sitter space AdS_d consistent with eq. (1.3.13) is necessarily the following:

$$R^{\rho\sigma}_{\mu\nu} = \frac{4}{(d-1)(d-2)}\,\mathcal{V}(\varphi_0)\,\delta^{[\rho}_{[\mu}\,\delta^{\sigma]}_{\nu]} \tag{1.3.14}$$

Consider next the equation for a covariantly constant spinor in AdS_d. Its general form is:

$$D^{(\mathrm{AdS})}_\mu\epsilon \ \equiv \ \mathcal{D}_\mu\epsilon(x) - \mu\,\gamma_\mu\,\epsilon = (\partial_\mu - \frac{1}{4}\omega^{bc}{}_\mu\gamma_{bc} - \mu\,\gamma_\mu) = 0 \tag{1.3.15}$$

---

[10] As already stressed, the v.e.v.s of all the fermions are zero and equation (1.3.8) guarantees that they remain zero under supersymmetry transformations of parameters (1.3.9).

where the parameter μ is fixed by integrability in terms of the vacuum value of potential $\mathcal{V}(\varphi_0)$. Indeed, from the condition $D^{(\mathrm{AdS})}_{[\mu} D^{(\mathrm{AdS})}_{\nu]} = 0$ we immediately get:

$$|\mu|^2 = \frac{|\mathcal{V}(\varphi_0)|}{(d-1)(d-2)} \tag{1.3.16}$$

On the other hand the general form of the gravitino transformation rule is, independently from the number of space–time dimensions, that given in eq. (1.3.3), so that, in a conventional vacuum with an unbroken supersymmetry, μ is to be interpreted as **eigenvalue** of the gravitino mass–matrix. So the general conditions for the preservation of $\mathcal{N}_0$ supersymmetries in d dimensions are fully analogous to those in eq. (1.3.8) and correspond to the existence of $\mathcal{N}_0$ independent vectors $\rho^i_{(\ell)}$ ($\ell = 1, \dots, \mathcal{N}_0$), such that:

$$\begin{aligned} S_{ij}\,(\varphi_0)\ \rho^j_{(\ell)} &= e^{\mathrm{i}\theta}\sqrt{\tfrac{|\mathcal{V}(\varphi_0)|}{(d-2)(d-1)}}\,\rho_{i(\ell)}\ , \\ \Sigma_i^{\ i}\,(\varphi_0)\ \rho^i_{(\ell)} &= 0\ , \end{aligned} \tag{1.3.17}$$

By extension of language, the vectors $\rho^i_{(\ell)}$ are named **Killing spinors**.
In the next section we explicitly discuss these features for $\mathcal{N} = 2$ theory in $d = 5$.

1.4 Gauged supergravities in five dimensions

The general form of *gauged* $\mathcal{N} = 2$ supergravity in five–dimensions has been obtained only recently. This occurred through the contributions of two groups of authors. In a first step, Günaydin and Zagerman analyzed the problem of gauging in the presence of an arbitrary number of vector and tensor multiplets. In a series of papers [58, 59, 60] they established the key new features involved by the gauging procedure in this space-time dimension. In a subsequent step, Ceresole and Dall'Agata [5], utilizing the general methods of the geometrical gauging [54, 61, 43, 62], reconsidered the problem and succeeded in including also the coupling to hypermultiplets. Since $\mathcal{N} = 2$, that corresponds to $N_Q = 8$ supercharges, is the minimal possible number of supersymmetries in a five–dimensional space–time, it is clear that this result is a relevant step for the construction of phenomenological models with minimal supersymmetry like the Randall Sundrum scenarios and more generically to understand better the supposed gravity/gauge theory correspondence. I already pointed out that in maximal supergravities the number of available gauge vectors is fixed a priori and the possible gauge algebras fill a discrete set. In matter coupled supergravities, on the other hand, the number of vector multiplets varies and one has much more possibilities. If the number of supercharges N_Q is larger than eight, the only available multiplets, beside the graviton multiplet, are the vector or tensor multiplets; furthermore, given their number n, the geometry of the scalar manifold is fixed and corresponds to a homogeneous space $\mathcal{G}_n/\mathcal{H}_n$. At $N_Q = 8$, instead, besides vector or tensor multiplets (that can be dualised to vector multiplets), one has also hypermultiplets so that the scalar manifold $\mathcal{M}_{scalar} = \mathcal{M}_{vect.scal.} \times \mathcal{M}_{hyp.scal.}$

is the tensor product of two submanifolds containing the vector scalars and the hyper scalars respectively. As we have seen in sect.1.2.1-1.2.2, although severely constrained, the geometry of these two submanifolds is not completely fixed by supersymmetry and can vary within an ample class that contains both homogeneous and non homogeneous spaces. As I also recalled, there is a very close structural relation between $N_Q = 8$ supergravity in $d = 4$ and in $d = 5$ dimensions: the geometry of the hypermultiplet scalars is the same in both theories, namely *quaternionic geometry* (see sect.1.2.2) while the vector scalars fill a *special Kähler* complex manifold in $d = 4$ and a *very special* real manifold in $d = 5$. Dimensional reduction on a circle maps $d = 5$ theories into $d = 4$ theories and provides a map from very special to a subclass of special Kähler manifolds. Hence it is not surprising that the *gauging procedure* in $d = 4$ and $d = 5$ theories are extremely similar: yet there are some relevant differences that had to be clarified before one could extend the constructions of [43, 62] to one higher space–time dimensions. These differences have essentially to do with two specifically five–dimensional features:

a Very special, differently from special Kähler manifolds are real and non–symplectic. So there is no notion of a moment-map for isometries

b In the presence of gauging, vector and tensor multiplets become physically distinct and the vector fields that are in a non trivial non–adjoint representation of the gauge group have to be dualised to massive self–dual 2–forms.

To accomplish this program my first care is to discuss the general idea of the moment map which constitutes an essential ingredient in the $\mathcal{N} = 2$ case.

1.4.1 The Moment Map

The moment map is a construction that applies to all manifolds with a symplectic structure, in particular to Kähler, HyperKähler or quaternionic manifolds.

I begin with the Kähler case, namely with the moment map of holomorphic isometries which is the paradigm for all the other cases. It is also the additional weapon one can use in gauging $d = 4$ supergravity while it is not available for $d = 5$ vector multiplets due to the real structure of very special geometry. The HyperKähler and quaternionic cases correspond, instead, to the moment map of triholomorphic isometries which equally applies to $d = 4$ and $d = 5$ theories.

The holomorphic moment map on Kähler manifolds

I assume some basic knowledge of Kähler geometry which can be retrieved from any standard textbook. Let $g_{ij^\star}$ be the Kähler metric of a Kähler manifold $\mathcal{M}$ and let us assume that $g_{ij^\star}$ admits a non trivial group of continuous isometries $\mathcal{G}$ generated by Killing vectors $k^i_{\mathbf{I}}$ ($\mathbf{I} = 1, \ldots, \dim \mathcal{G}$) that define the infinitesimal variation of the complex coordinates z^i under the group action:

$$z^i \rightarrow z^i + \epsilon^{\mathbf{I}} k^i_{\mathbf{I}}(z) \tag{1.4.1}$$

Let $k^i_{\mathbf{I}}(z)$ be a basis of holomorphic Killing vectors for the metric $g_{ij^\star}$. Holomorphicity means the following differential constraint:

$$\partial_{j^*} k^i_{\mathbf{I}}(z) = 0 \leftrightarrow \partial_j k^{i^*}_{\mathbf{I}}(\bar{z}) = 0 \tag{1.4.2}$$

while the generic Killing equation (suppressing the gauge index $\mathbf{I}$):

$$\nabla_\mu k_\nu + \nabla_\mu k_\nu = 0 \tag{1.4.3}$$

in holomorphic indices reads as follows:

$$\nabla_i k_j + \nabla_j k_i \;=\; 0 \quad ; \quad \nabla_{i^*} k_j + \nabla_j k_{i^*} \;=\; 0 \tag{1.4.4}$$

where the covariant components are defined as $k_j = g_{ji^*} k^{i^*}$ (and similarly for k_{i^*}).

The vectors $k^i_{\mathbf{I}}$ are generators of infinitesimal holomorphic coordinate transformations $\delta z^i = \epsilon^{\mathbf{I}} k^i_{\mathbf{I}}(z)$ which leave the metric invariant. In the same way as the metric is the derivative of a more fundamental object, the Killing vectors in a Kähler manifold are the derivatives of suitable prepotentials. Indeed, the first of eq.s (1.4.4) is automatically satisfied by holomorphic vectors and the second equation reduces to the following one:

$$k^i_{\mathbf{I}} = i g^{ij^*} \partial_{j^*} P_{\mathbf{I}}, \quad P^*_{\mathbf{I}} = P_{\mathbf{I}} \tag{1.4.5}$$

In other words if we can find a real function $P^{\mathbf{I}}$ such that the expression $ig^{ij^*}\partial_{j^*} P_{(\mathbf{I})}$ is holomorphic, then eq. (1.4.5) defines a Killing vector.

The construction of the Killing prepotential can be stated in a more precise geometrical fashion through the notion of *moment map.* Let us review this construction.

Consider a Kählerian manifold $\mathcal{M}$ of real dimension $2n$. Consider a compact Lie group $\mathcal{G}$ acting on $\mathcal{M}$ by means of Killing vector fields $\overrightarrow{X}$ which are holomorphic with respect to the complex structure J of $\mathcal{M}$; then these vector fields preserve also the Kähler 2-form

$$\left.\begin{array}{lcl} \mathcal{L}_{\overrightarrow{X}} g = 0 & \leftrightarrow & \nabla_{(\mu} X_{\nu)} = 0 \\ \mathcal{L}_{\overrightarrow{X}} J = 0 & & \end{array}\right\} \;\Rightarrow\; 0 = \mathcal{L}_{\overrightarrow{X}} K = i_{\overrightarrow{X}} dK + d(i_{\overrightarrow{X}} K) = d(i_{\overrightarrow{X}} K) \tag{1.4.6}$$

Here $\mathcal{L}_{\overrightarrow{X}}$ and $i_{\overrightarrow{X}}$ denote respectively the Lie derivative along the vector field $\overrightarrow{X}$ and the contraction (of forms) with it.

If $\mathcal{M}$ is simply connected, $d(i_{\overrightarrow{X}} K) = 0$ implies the existence of a function $P_{\overrightarrow{X}}$ such that

$$-\frac{1}{2\pi} dP_{\overrightarrow{X}} = i_{\overrightarrow{X}} K \tag{1.4.7}$$

The function $P_{\overrightarrow{X}}$ is defined up to a constant, which can be arranged so as to make it equivariant:

$$\overrightarrow{X} P_{\overrightarrow{Y}} = P_{[\overrightarrow{X}, \overrightarrow{Y}]} \tag{1.4.8}$$

$P_{\overrightarrow{X}}$ constitutes then a *moment map.* This can be regarded as a map

$$P : \mathcal{M} \longrightarrow \mathbb{R} \otimes \mathbb{G}^* \tag{1.4.9}$$

where $\mathbb{G}^*$ denotes the dual of the Lie algebra $\mathbb{G}$ of the group $\mathcal{G}$. Indeed, let $x \in \mathbb{G}$ be the Lie algebra element corresponding to the Killing vector $\overrightarrow{X}$; then, for a given $m \in \mathcal{M}$

$$\mu(m) \,:\, x \longrightarrow P_{\overrightarrow{X}}(m) \in \mathbb{R} \tag{1.4.10}$$

is a linear functional on $\mathbb{G}$. If we expand $\overrightarrow{X} = a^{\mathbf{I}} k_{\mathbf{I}}$ in a basis of Killing vectors $k_{\mathbf{I}}$ such that

$$[k_{\mathbf{I}}, k_{\mathbf{L}}] = f_{\mathbf{IL}}{}^{\mathbf{K}} k_{\mathbf{K}} \tag{1.4.11}$$

we also have

$$P_{\overrightarrow{X}} = a^{\mathbf{I}} P_{\mathbf{I}} \tag{1.4.12}$$

In the following we use the shorthand notation $\mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{I}}, i_{\mathbf{I}}$ for the Lie derivative and the contraction along the chosen basis of Killing vectors $k_{\mathbf{I}}$.

From a geometrical point of view the prepotential, or moment map, $P_{\mathbf{I}}$ is the Hamiltonian function providing the Poissonian realization of the Lie algebra on the Kähler manifold. This is just another way of stating the already mentioned *equivariance*. Indeed the very existence of the closed 2-form K guarantees that every Kähler space is a symplectic manifold and that we can define a Poisson bracket.

Consider eqs.(1.4.5). To every generator of the abstract Lie algebra $\mathbb{G}$ we have associated a function $P_{\mathbf{I}}$ on $\mathcal{M}$; the Poisson bracket of $P_{\mathbf{I}}$ with $P_{\mathbf{J}}$ is defined as follows:

$$\{P_{\mathbf{I}}, P_{\mathbf{J}}\} \equiv 4\pi K(\mathbf{I}, \mathbf{J}) \tag{1.4.13}$$

where $K(\mathbf{I}, \mathbf{J}) \equiv K(\vec{k}_{\mathbf{I}}, \vec{k}_{\mathbf{J}})$ is the value of K along the pair of Killing vectors.

In reference [43] the following lemma is proved:

Lemma 1.4.1 *The following identity is true:*

$$\{P_{\mathbf{I}}, P_{\mathbf{J}}\} = f_{\mathbf{IJ}}{}^{\mathbf{L}} P_{\mathbf{L}} + C_{\mathbf{IJ}} \tag{1.4.14}$$

where $C_{\mathbf{IJ}}$ is a constant fulfilling the cocycle condition

$$f_{\mathbf{IM}}{}^{\mathbf{L}} C_{\mathbf{LJ}} + f_{\mathbf{MJ}}{}^{\mathbf{L}} C_{\mathbf{LI}} + f_{\mathbf{JI}}{}^{\mathbf{L}} C_{\mathbf{LM}} = 0 \tag{1.4.15}$$

If the Lie algebra $\mathbb{G}$ has a trivial second cohomology group $H^2(\mathbb{G}) = 0$, then the cocycle $C_{\mathbf{IJ}}$ is a coboundary; namely we have

$$C_{\mathbf{IJ}} = f_{\mathbf{IJ}}{}^{\mathbf{L}} C_{\mathbf{L}} \tag{1.4.16}$$

where $C_{\mathbf{L}}$ are suitable constants. Hence, assuming $H^2(\mathbb{G}) = 0$, we can reabsorb $C_{\mathbf{L}}$ in the definition of $P_{\mathbf{I}}$:

$$P_{\mathbf{I}} \to P_{\mathbf{I}} + C_{\mathbf{I}} \tag{1.4.17}$$

and we obtain the stronger equation

$$\{P_{\mathbf{I}}, P_{\mathbf{J}}\} = f_{\mathbf{IJ}}{}^{\mathbf{L}} P_{\mathbf{L}} \tag{1.4.18}$$

Note that $H^2(\mathbb{G}) = 0$ is true for all semi-simple Lie algebras. Using eq. (1.4.14), eq. (1.4.18) can be rewritten in components as follows:

$$\frac{i}{2} g_{ij^*} (k_{\mathbf{I}}^i k_{\mathbf{J}}^{j^*} - k_{\mathbf{J}}^i k_{\mathbf{I}}^{j^*}) = \frac{1}{2} f_{\mathbf{IJ}}{}^{\mathbf{L}} P_{\mathbf{L}} \tag{1.4.19}$$

Equation (1.4.19) is identical with the equivariance condition in eq. (1.4.8).

The triholomorphic moment map on quaternionic manifolds

Next, closely following the original derivation of [43, 63], I turn to a discussion of the triholomorphic isometries of the manifold $\mathcal{QM}$ associated with hypermultiplets. Both in $d = 4$ and in $d = 5$ supergravity, $\mathcal{QM}$ is quaternionic and we can gauge only those of its isometries that are triholomorphic and that either generate an abelian group $\mathcal{G}$ or are *suitably realized* as isometries also on the special manifold $\mathcal{SV}$ [11]. This means that on $\mathcal{QM}$ we have Killing vectors:

$$\vec{k}_{\mathbf{I}} = k^X_{\mathbf{I}} \frac{\vec{\partial}}{\partial q^X} \tag{1.4.20}$$

satisfying the same Lie algebra as the corresponding Killing vectors on $\mathcal{VM}$. In other words

$$\hat{\vec{k}}_{\mathbf{I}} = k^x_{\mathbf{I}} \vec{\partial}_x + k^X_{\mathbf{I}} \vec{\partial}_X \tag{1.4.21}$$

is a Killing vector of the block diagonal metric:

$$\hat{g} = \begin{pmatrix} g_{xy} & 0 \\ 0 & g_{XY} \end{pmatrix} \tag{1.4.22}$$

defined on the product manifold $\mathcal{VM} \otimes \mathcal{QM}$. Let us first focus on the manifold $\mathcal{QM}$. Triholomorphicity means that the Killing vector fields leave the HyperKähler structure invariant up to SU(2) rotations in the SU(2)–bundle defined by eq. (1.2.30). Namely:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{I}} K^r \;=\; \tfrac{1}{2} \epsilon^{rst} K^s \alpha^t_{\mathbf{I}} \quad ; \quad \mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{I}} p^r \;=\; \tfrac{1}{2} \nabla \alpha^r_{\mathbf{I}} \tag{1.4.23}$$

where $\alpha^r_{\mathbf{I}}$ is an SU(2) compensator associated with the Killing vector $k^X_{\mathbf{I}}$.[12] The compensator $\alpha^r_{\mathbf{I}}$ necessarily fulfills the cocycle condition:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{I}} \alpha^r_{\mathbf{J}} - \mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{J}} \alpha^r_{\mathbf{I}} + \epsilon^{rst} \alpha^s_{\mathbf{I}} \alpha^t_{\mathbf{J}} = f_{\mathbf{IJ}}^{\cdot\cdot\mathbf{L}} \alpha^r_{\mathbf{L}} \tag{1.4.24}$$

In the HyperKähler case the SU(2)–bundle is flat and the compensator can be reabsorbed into the definition of the HyperKähler forms. In other words we can always find a map

$$\mathcal{QM} \;\longrightarrow\; L^r{}_s(q) \;\in\; \mathrm{SO}(3) \tag{1.4.25}$$

that trivializes the $\mathcal{SU}$–bundle globally. Redefining:

$$K^{r\prime} \;=\; L^r{}_s(q)\, K^s \tag{1.4.26}$$

---

[11] I anticipate the meaning of *suitably realized* to be discussed in later sections. By definition the gauge vectors are in the coadjoint representation of the gauge groups. The vectors transform linearly under isometries as the sections $h^{\tilde{I}}$ defining very special geometry. It follows that under the gauge algebra, these latter must decompose in a *coadjoint representation* plus, possibly, another representation R. The vectors in the representation R must be dualised to massive self dual 2–forms.

[12] The above relations find an effective application in this work for determining how gauge transformations act in presence of hypermultiplets couplings, see section 4.5 below.

the new HyperKähler form obeys the stronger equation:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{I}}K^{r\prime} = 0 \tag{1.4.27}$$

On the other hand, in the quaternionic case, the non–triviality of the $\mathcal{SU}$–bundle forbids to eliminate the W–compensator completely. Due to the identification between HyperKähler forms and SU(2) curvatures, eq. (1.4.23) is rewritten as:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{I}}R^r = \frac{1}{2}\epsilon^{rst}R^s\alpha^t_{\mathbf{I}} \quad ; \quad \mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{I}}p^r = \frac{1}{2}\nabla\alpha^r_{\mathbf{I}} \tag{1.4.28}$$

In both cases, anyhow, and in full analogy with the case of Kähler manifolds, to each Killing vector we can associate a triplet $P^r_{\mathbf{I}}(q)$ of 0-form prepotentials. Indeed, we can set:

$$\mathbf{i}_{\mathbf{I}}K^r = -\nabla P^r_{\mathbf{I}} \equiv -(dP^r_{\mathbf{I}} + 2\epsilon^{rst}p^sP^t_{\mathbf{I}}) \tag{1.4.29}$$

where ∇ denotes the SU(2) covariant exterior derivative.

As in the Kähler case, eq. (1.4.29) defines a moment map:

$$P : \mathcal{M} \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^3 \otimes \mathcal{G}^* \tag{1.4.30}$$

where $\mathcal{G}^*$ denotes the dual of the Lie algebra $\mathcal{G}$ of the group $\mathcal{G}$. Indeed, let $x \in \mathcal{G}$ be the Lie algebra element corresponding to the Killing vector $\overrightarrow{\chi}$; then, for a given $m \in \mathcal{M}$

$$\mu(m) : x \longrightarrow P_{\overrightarrow{\chi}}(m) \in \mathbb{R}^3 \tag{1.4.31}$$

is a linear functional on $\mathcal{G}$. If we expand $\overrightarrow{\chi} = a^{\mathbf{I}}k_{\mathbf{I}}$ on a basis of Killing vectors $k_{\mathbf{I}}$ such that

$$[k_{\mathbf{I}}, k_{\mathbf{L}}] = f_{\mathbf{IL}}{}^{\mathbf{K}}k_{\mathbf{K}} \tag{1.4.32}$$

and we also choose a basis $\mathbf{i}_r$ $(r = 1, 2, 3)$ for $\mathbb{R}^3$ we get:

$$P_{\overrightarrow{\chi}} = a^{\mathbf{I}}P^r_{\mathbf{I}}\,\mathbf{i}_r \tag{1.4.33}$$

Furthermore we need a generalization of the equivariance defined by eq. (1.4.8)

$$\overrightarrow{\chi} \circ P_{\overrightarrow{\zeta}} = P_{[\overrightarrow{\chi},\overrightarrow{\zeta}]} \tag{1.4.34}$$

In the HyperKähler case, the left–hand side of eq. (1.4.34) is defined as the usual action of a vector field on a 0–form:

$$\overrightarrow{\chi} \circ P_{\overrightarrow{\zeta}} = \mathbf{i}_{\overrightarrow{\chi}}\,dP_{\overrightarrow{\zeta}} = \chi^X\frac{\partial}{\partial q^X}P_{\overrightarrow{\zeta}} \tag{1.4.35}$$

The equivariance condition implies that we can introduce a triholomorphic Poisson bracket defined as follows:

$$\{P_{\mathbf{I}}, P_{\mathbf{J}}\}^r \equiv 2K^r(\mathbf{I}, \mathbf{J}) \tag{1.4.36}$$

leading to the triholomorphic Poissonian realization of the Lie algebra:

$$\{P_{\mathbf{I}}, P_{\mathbf{J}}\}^r = f^{\mathbf{K}}{}_{\mathbf{IJ}}\,P^r_{\mathbf{K}} \tag{1.4.37}$$

which in components reads:

$$K^r_{XY}\, k^X_{\mathbf{I}}\, k^Y_{\mathbf{J}} \;=\; \frac{1}{2}\, f^{\mathbf{K}}{}_{\mathbf{IJ}}\, P^r_{\mathbf{K}} \tag{1.4.38}$$

In the quaternionic case, instead, the left–hand side of eq. (1.4.34) is interpreted as follows:

$$\vec{\chi} \circ P_{\vec{\zeta}} \;=\; \mathbf{i}_{\vec{\chi}}\, \nabla P_{\vec{\zeta}} \;=\; \chi^X\, \nabla_X\, P_{\vec{\zeta}} \tag{1.4.39}$$

where ∇ is the SU(2)–covariant differential. Correspondingly, the triholomorphic Poisson bracket is defined as follows:

$$\{P_{\mathbf{I}}, P_{\mathbf{J}}\}^r \equiv 2K^r(\mathbf{I}, \mathbf{J}) - \lambda\, \varepsilon^{rst}\, P^s_{\mathbf{I}}\, P^t_{\mathbf{J}} \tag{1.4.40}$$

and leads to the Poissonian realization of the Lie algebra

$$\{P_{\mathbf{I}}, P_{\mathbf{J}}\}^r \;=\; f^{\mathbf{K}}{}_{\mathbf{IJ}}\, P^r_{\mathbf{K}} \tag{1.4.41}$$

which in components reads:

$$K^r_{XY}\, k^X_{\mathbf{I}}\, k^Y_{\mathbf{J}} \;-\; \frac{\lambda}{2}\, \varepsilon^{rst}\, P^s_{\mathbf{I}}\, P^t_{\mathbf{J}} \;=\; \frac{1}{2}\, f^{\mathbf{K}}{}_{\mathbf{IJ}}\, P^r_{\mathbf{K}} \tag{1.4.42}$$

Eq. (1.4.42), which is the most convenient way of expressing equivariance in a coordinate basis, was originally written in [43] and has played a fundamental role in the construction of supersymmetric actions for gauged $\mathcal{N} = 2$ supergravity both in $d = 4$ [43, 62] and in $d = 5$ [5].

1.4.2 $\mathcal{N} = 2$ gaugings and the composite connections

Equipped with the crucial geometric structure provided by the triholomorphic moment-map, let us come to the problem of gauging a general $\mathcal{N} = 2$ matter coupled supergravity as described by the bosonic lagrangian (1.2.55). To single out a viable gauge group we have to go through a few steps that have been derived by Günaydin and Zagerman in [58, 59, 60].

The first thing we have to consider is the isometry group $\mathcal{G}_{iso}$ of the special manifold $\mathcal{SV}_n$. Later we have to see how it might be represented on the quaternionic manifold $\mathcal{QM}$.

By definition, the vectors are in the representation $\mathbf{R}$ of $\mathcal{G}_{iso}$. What we can gauge is any $n_V + 1$–dimensional subgroup $G_g \subset \mathcal{G}_{iso}$ such that certain conditions are satisfied. The conditions are:

a) The following branching must be true:

$$\mathbf{R} \overset{G_g}{\Longrightarrow} \text{Coadj}(G_g) \oplus \mathbf{D}_S \tag{1.4.43}$$

where

b) $\mathbf{D}_S$ denotes some reducible or irreducible **symplectic representation** of the candidate gauge group G_g different from the coadjoint. By symplectic we mean the following. Let us decompose the range of the index $\tilde{I}$ as in eq. (1.2.9), where

$$\mathbf{I} = 1, \dots, n_V + 1 \equiv \dim G_g \tag{1.4.44}$$

runs on the coadjoint representation of the G_g Lie algebra and whose generators we denote by $T_\mathbf{I}$, with commutation relations

$$[T_\mathbf{I}\,,\, T_\mathbf{J}] = f_{\mathbf{IJ}}^{\mathbf{K}}\, T_\mathbf{K} \tag{1.4.45}$$

and

$$M = 1, \dots, n_T = \dim \mathbf{D}_S \tag{1.4.46}$$

runs on a basis of the representation $\mathbf{D}_S$. Let $\Lambda_{\mathbf{I}M}^{N}$ be the matrix representing the generator $T_\mathbf{I}$ in $\mathbf{D}_S$:

$$T_\mathbf{I} \quad \to \quad \Lambda_\mathbf{I} \quad ; \quad [\Lambda_\mathbf{I}\,,\, \Lambda_\mathbf{J}] = f_{\mathbf{IJ}}^{\mathbf{K}}\, \Lambda_\mathbf{K} \tag{1.4.47}$$

In order for the representation to be symplectic there must exist an antisymmetric $n_T \times n_T$ matrix $\Omega^T = -\Omega$ that squares to minus the identity $\Omega^2 = -\mathbf{1}$ and such that:

$$\forall T_\mathbf{I} \in G_g \quad \Omega\, \Lambda_\mathbf{I} + \Lambda_\mathbf{I}^T\, \Omega = 0 \tag{1.4.48}$$

Indeed, this ensures that our algebra G_g is a subalgebra of the symplectic algebra $\mathrm{Sp}(n_T, \mathbb{R})$.

c) The $C_{\tilde{I}\tilde{J}\tilde{K}}$ invariant tensor must decompose under G_g in the following way:

$$C_{\tilde{I}\tilde{J}\tilde{K}} = \left\{ \begin{array}{rcl} C_{\mathbf{IJK}} & = & \text{Invariant tensor in the Coadj}(G_g) \\ C_{MNP} & = & 0 \\ C_{M\mathbf{IJ}} & = & 0 \\ C_{MN\mathbf{I}} & = & -\frac{\sqrt{6}}{2}\Omega_{MP}\, \Lambda_{\mathbf{I}N}^{P} \end{array} \right. \tag{1.4.49}$$

d) The group G_g, selected through the previous restriction, must act as a triholomorphic isometry on the quaternionic manifold $\mathcal{QM}$ [13].

The rationale for the above requirements is the following. The reason for the requirement **a)** is the same as in four–dimensions. Since the gauge vectors are by definition in the coadjoint of the gauge algebra, it is necessary that the representation to which the vectors are pre–assigned should contain the coadjoint of what we want to gauge. Note also that for semisimple groups, adjoint and coadjoint representations are equivalent but this is no longer true in the case of non semisimple gauge algebras. An extreme possibility is provided by abelian algebras

$$\mathcal{A} = \mathrm{U}(1)^\ell \otimes \mathbb{R}^m \tag{1.4.50}$$

---

[13] This last requirement is that spelled out by Ceresole and Dall'Agata in [5] who have extended to the $d = 5$ case the methods and procedures of the geometrical gaugings originally introduced in [54, 61, 43, 62].

where we were careful to distinguish compact from non compact generators. In this case the coadjoint representation vanishes and any set of $\ell + m$ vectors can be used to gauge an algebra $\mathcal{A}$ that has vanishing action on the very special manifold $\mathcal{SV}_n$. The rationale for the requirements **b)** and **c)** is instead related to the consistent coupling of massive 2–forms. Gauge vectors that are in non trivial representations of a gauge group different from the coadjoint representation are inconsistent with their own gauge invariance. To cure this problem we have to dualise them to massive self–dual 2–forms, satisfying:

$$B^{M|\mu\nu} = m\epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma\lambda}\mathcal{D}_\rho B^M_{\sigma\lambda} \,. \tag{1.4.51}$$

where the covariant derivative is :

$$\mathcal{D}B^M \equiv dB^M + g\Lambda^M_{\mathbf{I}N} A^{\mathbf{I}} \wedge B^N \equiv \mathcal{H}^M \tag{1.4.52}$$

This is possible only if the part of the Chern Simons term involving two B's and one A can be reabsorbed in the kinetic term of the 2–forms that reads as follows:

$$\mathcal{L}^{kin}_B = \frac{1}{4g}\,\epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma\lambda} B^M_{\mu\nu}\,\mathcal{D}_\rho B^N_{\sigma\lambda}\,\Omega_{MN} \tag{1.4.53}$$

The last requirement **(d)** deals with the possible presence of hypermultiplets. In particular, the action of G_g on the quaternionic manifold can be the identity action, which is certainly triholomorphic. In this case the hypermultiplets are simply neutral with respect to the gauge group. Alternatively, we can consider an abelian algebra, as in eq. (1.4.50), that has no action on the very special manifold but acts by non trivial triholomorphic isometries on the quaternionic manifold. Both of these are extreme cases that allow more freedom of choice for one of the two manifolds. The general case corresponds to a choice of G_g that acts non trivially both on $\mathcal{SV}_n$ and $\mathcal{QM}_m$ and respects conditions **a)-d)**.

Assuming that the gauge algebra has been selected and satisfies the above criteria, the gauging procedure becomes smooth and fully parallel to the four–dimensional models we have already discussed. The essential point is always the same, namely the **gauging** of the **scalar vielbein** and of the **composite connections** acting on the fermion fields. In the case of maximal supersymmetry, where the scalar manifold is necessarily a homogeneous space $\mathcal{G}/\mathcal{H}$, these two gaugings are obtained in one stroke by gauging the Maurer–Cartan 1–forms. In the non maximal case we have to do it separately and specifically for the different factors occurring in the scalar manifold. These latter are not necessarily coset manifolds but have a sufficiently *special* geometric structure to allow the generic construction of those ingredients that are necessary for the gauging of the composite connections, most relevant being the role of the triholomorphic moment-map.

Let us begin with the gauging of the scalar vielbein. This is equivalent to replacing the ordinary derivatives (or differentials) of the scalar fields with covariant ones, as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}\phi^{\tilde{x}} &= d\phi^{\tilde{x}} + gA^{\mathbf{I}} k^{\tilde{x}}_{\mathbf{I}}(\phi) \\ \mathcal{D}q^X &= dq^X + gA^{\mathbf{I}} k^X_{\mathbf{I}}(q) \end{aligned} \tag{1.4.54}$$

where g is the gauge coupling constant and $k^{\tilde{x}}_{\mathbf{I}}(\phi), k^{X}_{\mathbf{I}}(q)$ are the killing vectors expressing the action of the gauge algebra generators $T_{\mathbf{I}}$ on the two scalar manifolds:

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_I \phi^{\tilde{x}} &= k^{\tilde{x}}_{\mathbf{I}}(\phi) \\ \delta_I q^X &= k^{X}_{\mathbf{I}}(q) \end{aligned} \tag{1.4.55}$$

Next we have the gauging of the composite connections. There are three of them corresponding to the three vector bundles of which the fermions are sections:

1. The Levi–Civita connection $\Gamma^{\tilde{x}}{}_{\tilde{y}}$ on the tangent bundle to the very special manifold $T\mathcal{SV}_n$. This enters because the gauginos $\lambda^{\tilde{x}}_i$ carry a world index of the very special manifold, namely are sections of $T\mathcal{SV}_n$.

2. The $\mathrm{Sp}(2n_H,\mathbb{R})$ connection Δ^{AB}. This enters because the hyperinos ζ^A are sections of the $\mathrm{Sp}(2n_H,\mathbb{R})$ bundle over the quaternionic manifold $\mathcal{QM}$. By definition this latter has reduced holonomy, so that the structural group of the tangent bundle $T\mathcal{QM}$ is $\mathrm{SU}(2) \times \mathrm{Sp}(2n_H,\mathbb{R})$, as we know from section 1.2.2.

3. The $\mathrm{SU_R}(2)$ connection of R–symmetry p^{ij}. This connection enters the game because both the gravitino ψ_i and the gauginos $\lambda^{\tilde{x}}_i$ are sections of the $SU(2)_R$ vector bundle in the fundamental doublet representation (the index $i = 1, 2$ denotes this fact). On the other hand the R–symmetry bundle is identified with the $\mathcal{SU} \to \mathcal{QM}$ bundle over the quaternionic manifold and this means that the connection p^{ij} is the connection of the $\mathcal{SU}$ bundle described in section 1.2.2.

In terms of the Killing vectors and of the the triholomorphic moment map $\mathcal{P}^x_{\mathbf{I}}(q)$ and just following the original recipe developed in [43] and further clarified in [62] the gauging of the connections is given by:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} T\mathcal{VS} & : & \text{tangent bundle} & \Gamma^{\tilde{x}}{}_{\tilde{y}} & \rightarrow & \hat{\Gamma}^{\tilde{x}}{}_{\tilde{y}} = \Gamma^{\tilde{x}}{}_{\tilde{y}} + g\, A^{\mathbf{I}}\, \partial_{\tilde{y}} k^{\tilde{x}}_{\mathbf{I}} \\ \mathcal{SU} & : & \mathrm{SU}(2)\ \text{bundle} & p^r & \rightarrow & \hat{p}^r = p^r + g_R\, A^{\mathbf{I}}\, P^r_{\mathbf{I}} \\ \mathcal{SU}^{-1} \otimes T\mathcal{QM} & : & \mathrm{Sp}(2m,\mathbb{R})\ \text{bundle} & \Delta^{AB} & \rightarrow & \hat{\Delta}^{AB} = \Delta^{AB} + g\, A^{\mathbf{I}}\, \partial_X k^{Y}_{\mathbf{I}}\, f^{X|iA}\, f^{B}_{Y|i} \end{array} \tag{1.4.56}$$

where g is the same gauge coupling constant as in eq. (1.4.54) while g_R is an additional coupling constant that allows to gauge or not to gauge the R-symmetry group $SU(2)$. In the construction of the lagrangian and in checking the closure of the supersymmetry algebra it turns out that g and g_R are independent parameters [5].

1.4.3 The Fermion shifts and gravitino mass-matrix

Gauging the connections forces, through closure of the supersymmetry algebra, the inclusion of new non–derivative terms in the *susy* rules of the fermions that are completely analogous to their 4–dimensional counterparts of eq.s (1.3.3) and (1.3.5). Indeed as explained in sect.1.3.1 the gauging procedure of supergravity theories fits into a general and uniform pattern for all space–time dimensions d and for all number of supersymmetry charges N_Q. The gravitino transformation rule (1.2.11) becomes:

$$\delta\psi_{i\mu} = \mathcal{D}_\mu\,\epsilon_i + i\frac{1}{4\sqrt{6}}\,\mathcal{T}^{\rho\sigma}_{ij}\,(4g_{\mu\rho}\,\gamma_\sigma - \gamma_{\mu\rho\sigma})\,\epsilon^j \;+\; S_{ij}\,\epsilon^j \tag{1.4.57}$$

where the gravitino mass matrix is given by:

$$S_{ij} = \mathrm{i}\,g_R\,\frac{1}{\sqrt{6}}\,h^{\mathbf{I}}(\phi)\,P^r_{\mathbf{I}}(q)\;(\sigma_r)_i{}^k\;\epsilon_{jk} \tag{1.4.58}$$

while the transformation rules of the spin 1/2 fermions have been determined by Ceresole and Dall'Agata (see [5]) to have, apart from some trivial choice of normalizations, an identical form to their counterparts in $d = 4$ $\mathcal{N} = 2$ supergravity (see [43, 62]). Indeed one finds:

$$\begin{aligned} \delta\zeta^A &= \text{derivative terms} + \Sigma^{A|i}\,\epsilon_i \\ \delta\lambda^{\tilde{x}i} &= \text{derivative terms} + \Sigma^{\tilde{x}i|j}\,\epsilon_j \end{aligned} \tag{1.4.59}$$

where the fermion shifts take the following explicit form:

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma^{\tilde{x}i|j} &= g\epsilon^{ij}W^{\tilde{x}} + g_R W^{\tilde{x}ij} \\ W^{\tilde{x}} &= \frac{\sqrt{6}}{4}\,k^{\tilde{x}}_{\mathbf{I}}h^{\mathbf{I}} \\ W^{\tilde{x}ij} &= \mathrm{i}(\sigma_r)_k{}^j\,\epsilon^{ki}P^r_{\mathbf{I}}\,g^{\tilde{x}\tilde{y}}h^{\mathbf{I}}_{\tilde{y}} \end{aligned} \tag{1.4.60}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma^{A|i} &= g\,\epsilon^{ij}\,\mathbf{N}^A_j \\ N^A_j &= -\frac{\sqrt{6}}{4}\,f^j_{XA}\,k^X_{\mathbf{I}}\,h^{\mathbf{I}} \end{aligned} \tag{1.4.61}$$

Indeed, if one compares eq.s (1.4.58),(1.4.61) with their 4–dimensional counterparts given in eq.s (8.23) of [62] one sees that (apart from the overall normalization which can be reabsorbed into the normalization of the corresponding fermionic field) the two sets of formulae are identical upon the replacement of the complex section $L^\Lambda(z)$ of *special Kähler geometry* with the real section $h^{\mathbf{I}}(\phi)$ of *very special geometry.* The other noteworthy difference is that in $d = 4$ the index Λ runs over the whole set of $n + 1$ values, n being the dimension of the special Kähler manifold. In five dimensions, instead, the index $\mathbf{I}$ runs over the $n_V + 1$ subset of values corresponding to the gauged vectors while the total dimension of the very special space is $n_V + n_T$. The remaining n_T dimensions are, as we know, associated with the massive self-dual 2–forms.

In five as in all other dimensions supersymmetry imposes a Ward identity that is the straightforward generalization of eq. (1.3.6), namely:

$$\alpha\,S^{ij}\,S_{jk} \,-\, \beta\,K_{\tilde{x}\tilde{y}}\Sigma^{\tilde{x}|i}\Sigma^{\tilde{y}|j}\,\epsilon_{jk} \;=\; -\,\delta^i_k\,\mathcal{V} \tag{1.4.62}$$

where $K_{\tilde{x}\tilde{y}}$ is the kinetic matrix of the spin 1/2 fermions and α and β are just numerical coefficients that differ from their analogues in 4–dimensions only because of the differences in Lorentz algebra and γ-matrix manipulations. Verifying such an identity whose explicit form is not written down in their paper, the authors of [5] have proved the supersymmetry of the gauged action and calculated the final form of the potential that reads as follows:

$$\mathcal{V} = \frac{3}{4} g^2 \left[h^{\mathbf{I}} h^{\mathbf{J}} \left(k^{\tilde{x}}_{\mathbf{I}} k^{\tilde{y}}_{\mathbf{J}} g_{\tilde{x}\tilde{y}} + k^X_{\mathbf{I}} \, k^Y_{\mathbf{J}} \, g_{XY} \right) \right] - g_R^2 \left[\left(2 \, h^{\mathbf{I}} h^{\mathbf{J}} \; - \; g^{\tilde{x}\tilde{y}} h^{\mathbf{I}}_{\tilde{x}} \, h^{\mathbf{J}}_{\tilde{y}} \right) \, P^r_{\mathbf{I}} \, P^r_{\mathbf{J}} \right] \tag{1.4.63}$$

in terms of the moment-map (1.4.29) and of the section $h^{\mathbf{I}}$ of very special geometry and its derivative $h^{\mathbf{I}}_{\tilde{x}} = -\sqrt{\frac{3}{2}} \partial_{\tilde{x}} h^{\mathbf{I}}$ (see eq.s (1.2.20)).

1.4.4 The scalar potential and supersymmetry breaking

We can now summarize the results of the previous section writing the general form of the bosonic lagrangian for a general **gauged** $\mathcal{N} = 2, d = 5$ supergravity. The ungauged action (1.2.55) is replaced by the following gauged one:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}^{(gauged)}_{(d=5,\mathcal{N}=2)} \quad = \quad & \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{-g} \, \Big(R \, - \, \frac{1}{2} \, a_{\tilde{I}\tilde{J}}(\phi) F^{\tilde{I}}_{\mu\nu} \, F^{\tilde{J}|\mu\nu} \\ & + g_{\tilde{x}\tilde{y}}(\phi) \, D_\mu \phi^{\tilde{x}} \, D^\mu \, \phi^{\tilde{y}} + \, g_{XY}(q) \, D_\mu q^X \, D^\mu \, q^Y - 2\mathcal{V}(\phi, q) \Big) \\ & + \left(\frac{1}{6\sqrt{6}} C_{\mathbf{IJK}} \, F^{\mathbf{I}}_{\mu\nu} \, F^{\mathbf{J}}_{\rho\sigma} \, A^{\mathbf{K}}_\tau + \frac{1}{4g} \, \Omega_{\mathcal{M}\mathcal{N}} \, B^{\mathcal{M}}_{\mu\nu} \, \mathcal{D}_\rho \, B^N_{\sigma\tau} \right) \, \epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma\tau} \end{aligned} \tag{1.4.64}$$

where the potential $\mathcal{V}(\phi, q)$ is that given in eq. (1.4.63).

General pattern of supersymmetry breaking in $d = 5$ Following the general discussion of eq.s (1.3.17) in $\mathcal{N}$-extended $d = 5$ supergravity, a conventional vacuum configuration ϕ_0 that preserves $\mathcal{N}_0$ supersymmetries is characterized by the existence of $\mathcal{N}_0$ vectors $\rho^i_{(\ell)}$ ($\ell = 1, \ldots, \mathcal{N}_0$) of USp($\mathcal{N}$), such that

$$\begin{aligned} S_{ij} \, (\phi_0) \, \rho^j_{(\ell)} \quad &= \quad e^{\mathrm{i}\theta} \, \sqrt{\tfrac{|\mathcal{V}(\phi_0)|}{12}} \, \rho_{A(\ell)} \; , \\ \Sigma^{\tilde{x}}_i \, (\phi_0) \, \rho^i_{(\ell)} \quad &= \quad 0 \; , \end{aligned} \tag{1.4.65}$$

where θ is an irrelevant phase, $\mathcal{V}$ is the scalar potential and S_{ij} is the gravitino mass-matrix, uniformly defined for all $\mathcal{N}$ by eq. (1.4.57).

Properties of the $\mathcal{N} = 2$ potential and anti de Sitter vacua

At this point we finally discuss the properties of the scalar potential and which type of vacua it admits. In fact a great part of the interest in gauged supergravity with matter couplings is due to existence of a "tunable" potential with the choice of the gauging. This feature is fundamental to study phenomenological applications as Randall–Sundrum scenarios or to explore possible extensions of the gravity/gauge field correspondence.

In view of these facts it is specifically interesting to survey the conditions for the existence of anti de Sitter vacua. According to our general discussion, following eq. (1.3.1), we have anti de Sitter vacua if $\mathcal{V}(q_0, \phi_0) < 0$ for $\mathcal{V}'(q_0, \phi_0) = 0$. Thus it is straightforward to see that the only contribution which can allow for such solutions is the term[14]

$$\mathcal{V} = -\, g^2\, P^r\, P_r + \text{positive contributions} \tag{1.4.66}$$

coming from the R–symmetry gauging of the gravitinos. We have introduced the compact notation $P^r \equiv P^r_I h^I$ (see app.A). Indeed this is the only negative contribution to the potential. This implies that a simple Yang–Mills gauging, even in presence of both tensor and hypermultiplets, does not allow any anti de Sitter solution.

We can briefly analyze various cases.

a) If we set $n_H = 0$ there are no hypermultiplets and the quaternionic manifold disappears. Correspondingly, as already noted in [43, 62] for the 4-dimensional case, the killing vector $k^X_{\mathbf{I}}$ is zero while the triholomorphic moment maps are SU(2) Lie algebra valued constants $\xi^r_{\mathbf{I}}$ that, because of eq. (1.4.42), must satisfy the condition:

$$g\, f^{\mathbf{K}}_{\mathbf{IJ}}\, \xi^r_{\mathbf{K}} = \tfrac{1}{2}\, g_R\, \epsilon^{rst}\, \xi^s_{\mathbf{I}}\, \xi^t_{\mathbf{J}} \tag{1.4.67}$$

Generically the $\xi^r_{\mathbf{I}}$ break SU(2) → U(1). If the gauge group $\mathcal{G}$ contains a subgroup $H \equiv SU(2)$, this can be identified with the R–symmetry group setting $\xi^r_{\hat{\mathbf{I}}} = \delta^r_{\hat{\mathbf{I}}}$, $\xi^r_{\hat{\mathbf{I}}} \in H$.

a1) If at $n_H = 0$ one makes the choice $\xi_{\mathbf{I}} = (0, V_{\mathbf{I}}, 0)$, the condition (1.4.67) reduces to

$$f^{\mathbf{K}}_{\mathbf{IJ}} V_{\mathbf{K}} = 0 \tag{1.4.68}$$

As already noted in [43, 62] for the four–dimensional case this is the Fayet–Iliopoulos phenomenon which corresponds, in mathematical language to the possibility of lifting the moment-maps to a non zero level for all the generators belonging to the center of the gauge Lie algebra.

b) If we both set $n_H = 0$, namely we include no hypermultiplet but we also set $n_T = 0$ namely we consider only vector fields in the coadjoint representation of the gauge group (i.e. the symplectic representation $\mathbf{D}_S$ of the massive two forms is deleted), then one can easily prove that

$$k^{\tilde{x}} \equiv h^{\mathbf{I}}\, k^{\tilde{x}}_{\mathbf{I}} = 0 \tag{1.4.69}$$

This implies that the scalar potential 1.4.63 reduces to:

$$\mathcal{V} \;=\; -6g^2 \left[W^2 - \frac{3}{4} g^{xy} \partial_x W\, \partial_y W \right] \tag{1.4.70}$$

$$W(\phi) \;\equiv\; \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}} V_{\mathbf{I}} h^{\mathbf{I}}(\phi) \tag{1.4.71}$$

---

[14] Without loosing in generality we take $g = g_R$ for all the following part of the thesis.

the constant coefficients $V_{\mathbf{I}}$ being those introduced above and satisfying the consistency condition (1.4.68). The interesting thing about the potential (1.4.70) is that it follows from the general class of potentials of the form:

$$\mathcal{V} = -\alpha^2 \left[(d-1)\, W^2 \;-\; (d-2) g^{\Lambda\Sigma} \partial_\Lambda W\, \partial_\Sigma W\right] \tag{1.4.72}$$

where $W(\varphi)$ is a real function named the *superpotential*, d denotes the space–time dimensions and g^{xy} is the positive definite kinetic metric of the scalar fields. In [64] Townsend has shown that the structure (1.4.72) is precisely that required for vacuum stability. We note that in the presence of an arbitrary number of hypermultiplets and vector multiplets to require this form for the potential implies a condition on the phase of the prepotential Q^r (see app.A). We will show in chapter 3 that for the electrostatic spherically symmetric configurations, such condition is recovered as a consequence of the BPS requirement. The same happens for the flat domain wall solutions as observed in [20].

c) If we set $n_V + n_T = 0$ there are no vector multiplets and we have simply hypermultiplets. Then $h^0 = 1$ and there is just one gauge vector: the graviphoton whose action on the quaternionic manifold is described by the triholomorphic Killing vector $k^X_{\mathbf{0}}$. The potential is still non–zero and becomes

$$\mathcal{V} = \frac{3}{2} g^2\, k^X_{\mathbf{0}}\, k^X_{\mathbf{0}}\, g_{XY} \;-\; 4g^2\, P^r_{\mathbf{0}}\, P_{\mathbf{0}r} \tag{1.4.73}$$

which in principle can admit anti de Sitter vacua.

d) The minimal gauged 5–dimensional supergravity is retrieved as a subcase of the above, setting also the number of hypermultiplets to zero, with the scalar potential reducing to a cosmological term.

The topics described in this chapter will find a concrete application in the study of BPS solutions.

Chapter 2

Electrostatic spherically symmetric BPS solutions with Hypermultiplets

2.1 Introduction

As has been already underlined in the introductory chapter, in recent years five-dimensional $\mathcal{N} = 2$ gauged supergravity theories have received considerable attention primarily for their relevance to the AdS/CFT correspondence [4],[65]. In particular much interest has been directed toward the study of domain-wall supergravity solutions [23],[24], [17],[25],[26] as duals of renormalization group (RG) flows in the corresponding field theory [66],[67]. Also a strong motivation in this direction derives from phenomenological requests in brane-world scenarios obtained via M-theory compactifications and/or domain-wall type models [6],[7],[68].

Finding supersymmetric solutions of $\mathcal{N} = 2$, $D = 5$ supergravities is never an easy exercise [29]; it becomes a quite difficult task if one considers general couplings to matter and general gaugings. Partial results have been obtained so far, i.e. for cases where only special vector or hypermultiplet gaugings have been considered [69], [27]. Here we start a systematic program with the general aim to classify BPS solutions with vector, tensor and hypermultiplet couplings. The introduction of the hypermultiplets is crucial for widening the variety of solutions as compared to the case where only vector multiplets are present [20],[18],[19]. In particular, aside for the special example analyzed in [27], the existence of BPS black-hole solutions has not been investigated systematically before. In this chapter I address this task, reporting on and discussing the results of my work with S. Cacciatori and D. Zanon [28]. Of course, black-hole solutions are especially relevant since, via the AdS/CFT correspondence, they could describe the RG flows between field theories in different dimensions [70].

To treat the problem we restrict ourselves to the case of hypermultiplet couplings, with generic gauging, and a static $SO(4)$ symmetric ansatz for the metric. In this setting we study the integrability conditions that follow from the BPS equations and find a set of equations for the functions in the ansatz. The quaternionic geometries give equations for the scalars which are a generalization of the ones found in [20]. Then we analyze all these equations and check directly that they satisfy the equations of motion.

The presentation is organized as follows: in the next section we introduce the model specializing the general formula present in the previous chapter. We describe the form of the solutions we are looking for: obviously this choice determines the *physics* contained in the solution. Then we focus on the derivation of the BPS equations and study their integrability conditions. In section 2.3 we find the set of independent first order differential equations that are equivalent to the BPS conditions. In section 2.4 we show that the family of solutions we have found satisfy the equations of motion. In section 2.5 we discuss the properties of the BPS solutions in the special case of the universal hypermultiplet [8] and find an explicit result for a simple choice of the gauging. We conclude with some final remarks. Our notations and conventions, which are the same as in [28], are summarized in Appendix A.

2.2 The model and its BPS equations

We consider $\mathcal{N}$=2 gauged supergravities in five dimensions interacting with an arbitrary number of hypermultiplets (we postpone the study of vector multiplet couplings to the next chapter.). The field content of the theory is the following

- the supergravity multiplet
$$\{e_\mu^a \,, \psi_\mu^i \,, A_\mu\} \tag{2.2.1}$$
containing the *graviton* e_μ^a, two *gravitini* ψ_μ^i and the *graviphoton* A_μ, which is the only (abelian) gauge field present in the theory;

- n_H hypermultiplets
$$\{\zeta^A \,, q^X\} \tag{2.2.2}$$
containing the *hyperini* ζ^A with $A = 1, 2, \dots, 2n_H$, and the *scalars* q^X with $X = 1, 2, \dots, 4n_H$ which define a quaternionic Kähler manifold (see section 1.2.2) with metric g_{XY}.

The bosonic sector of the theory is described by the Lagrangian density presented in [5]

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}_{BOS} = & -\frac{1}{2}e\left[R + \frac{1}{2}F_{\mu\nu}F^{\mu\nu} + g_{XY}D_\mu q^X D^\mu q^Y\right] \\ & + \frac{1}{6\sqrt{6}}\epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma\tau}F_{\mu\nu}F_{\rho\sigma}A_\tau - e\mathcal{V}(q)\end{aligned} \tag{2.2.3}$$

with

$$D_\mu q^X = \partial_\mu q^X + gA_\mu K^X(q)$$

where $K^X(q)$ is a Killing vector on the quaternionic manifold and $\mathcal{V}(q)$ is the scalar potential as given in Appendix A.

We look for electrostatic spherical solutions that preserve half of the $\mathcal{N} = 2$ supersymmetries. To this end we make the following ansatz for the supergravity fields: we choose a metric which is $SO(4)$ symmetric with all the other fields depending on the holographic space-time coordinate r only. Moreover we fix the gauge for the graviphoton keeping only the A_t component different from zero.

Introducing spherical coordinates $(t, r, \theta, \phi, \psi)$ we write [27]

$$ds^2 = -e^{2v}dt^2 + e^{2w}dr^2 + r^2(d\theta^2 + \sin^2\theta d\phi^2 + \cos^2\theta d\psi^2) \tag{2.2.4}$$

where the functions v and w depend on r only. The variations of the fermionic fields under supersymmetry transformations give rise to the following BPS equations: for the gravitini we have [71]

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \;=\; \delta_\epsilon \psi_{\mu i} \;&=\; \partial_\mu \epsilon_i + \frac{1}{4}\omega_\mu^{ab}\gamma_{ab}\epsilon_i - \partial_\mu q^X {p_{Xi}}^j \epsilon_j - gA_\mu {P_i}^j \epsilon_j \\ &+\; \frac{i}{4\sqrt{6}}(\gamma_{\mu\nu\rho} - 4g_{\mu\nu}\gamma_\rho)F^{\nu\rho}\epsilon_i - \frac{i}{\sqrt{6}} g {P_i}^j \gamma_\mu \epsilon_j \end{aligned} \tag{2.2.5}$$

We note that in ref.[27] the corresponding equation contains an additional term. This extra term, which arises due to a incorrect interpretation of the covariant derivative acting on the spinor ϵ as given in [5], should not be present.

For the hyperini the equations $\delta_\epsilon \zeta^A = 0$ lead to

$$\left[\frac{i}{2}e^{-w} f_X^{Ai} q'^X \gamma_1 - i\frac{g}{2} f_X^{Ai} K^X e^{-v} A_t \gamma_0\right]\epsilon_i \;=\; \frac{\sqrt{6}}{4} g K^X f_X^{Ai} \epsilon_i \tag{2.2.6}$$

where we have set $q'^X = \partial_r q^X$

Without loss of generality it is convenient to parametrize the graviphoton as follows [1]

$$A_t = \sqrt{\frac{3}{2}}a(r)e^v \tag{2.2.7}$$

This allows to write explicitly the BPS equations for the gravitini

$$\begin{aligned} \Big\{ \partial_t {\delta_l}^k + \frac{1}{2}v' e^{v-w} {\delta_l}^k \gamma_0\gamma_1 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}} g e^v P^r {(\sigma_r)_l}^k \gamma_0 + \frac{i}{2} e^{v-w}(v'a + a'){\delta_l}^k \gamma_1 \\ -i\sqrt{\frac{3}{2}} g a e^v P^r {(\sigma_r)_l}^k \Big\} \epsilon_k = 0 \end{aligned} \tag{2.2.8}$$

$$\left[\partial_r {\delta_i}^j - i q'^X p_X^r {(\sigma_r)_i}^j + \frac{1}{2}(v'a + a')(i\gamma_0){\delta_i}^j + \frac{g}{\sqrt{6}} e^w P^r \gamma_1 {(\sigma_r)_i}^j\right]\epsilon_j = 0 \tag{2.2.9}$$

---

[1] Note that in [27] a was chosen to be a constant.

$$\left[\delta_i{}^j\partial_\theta - \frac{1}{2}e^{-w}\gamma_1\gamma_2\delta_i{}^j + i\frac{re^{-w}}{4}(v'a+a')\gamma_{012}\delta_i{}^j + \frac{gr}{\sqrt{6}}P^s(\sigma_s)_i{}^j\gamma_2\right]\epsilon_j = 0 \tag{2.2.10}$$

$$\left\{\delta_i{}^j\left[\partial_\phi - \frac{1}{2}e^{-w}\sin\theta\gamma_1\gamma_3 - \frac{1}{2}\cos\theta\gamma_2\gamma_3 + i\frac{re^{-w}}{4}(v'a+a')\sin\theta\gamma_{013}\right] + \frac{gr\sin\theta}{\sqrt{6}}P^s(\sigma_s)_i{}^j\gamma_3\right\}\epsilon_j = 0 \tag{2.2.11}$$

$$\left\{\delta_i{}^j\left[\partial_\psi - \frac{1}{2}e^{-w}\cos\theta\gamma_1\gamma_4 + \frac{1}{2}\sin\theta\gamma_2\gamma_4 + i\frac{re^{-w}}{4}(v'a+a')\cos\theta\gamma_{014}\right] + \frac{gr\cos\theta}{\sqrt{6}}P^s(\sigma_s)_i{}^j\gamma_4\right\}\epsilon_j = 0 \tag{2.2.12}$$

At this point, using (A.0.6) and the $SU(2)$ projection as in (A.0.8), we can rewrite the algebraic relations in (2.2.6) as

$$\left(ie^{-w}q'^X\gamma_1 - ig\sqrt{\frac{3}{2}}aK^X\gamma_0 - \sqrt{\frac{3}{2}}gK^X\right)\left(g_{ZX}\delta_j{}^i + 2iR^s_{ZX}(\sigma_s)_j{}^i\right)\epsilon_i = 0 \tag{2.2.13}$$

We will make use of the above expression in the following.

2.2.1 Integrability conditions

Now we want to discuss the integrability of the gravitini equations in order to ensure the existence of a Killing spinor (i.e of residual supersymmetry). The standard procedure is to impose the vanishing of the various commutators. In this way one obtains equations that combined with the hyperini ones determine the unknown functions in the ansatz and impose restrictions on the geometry (gauging). We find it useful to adopt the following notation: given the vector P^s $s = 1,2,3$ we introduce the phase $\vec{Q}$ so that $\vec{Q}\cdot\vec{Q} = 1$ and use the decomposition of the vector into its norm and phase

$$\vec{P} = \sqrt{\frac{3}{2}}W\vec{Q}\ . \tag{2.2.14}$$

We find four independent[2] integrability conditions that we list below:
from the commutators between the BPS equations (2.2.10), (2.2.11) and (2.2.12) we obtain

$$\left\{i\gamma_0\left[1 - e^{-2w} - \frac{r^2e^{-2w}}{4}(v'a+a')^2 + g^2r^2W^2\right]\delta_i{}^j\right.$$

---

[2] Symmetry arguments show that the angular equations lead to only one independent condition.

$$+\left[re^{-2w}\left(v'a+a'\right)\right]\delta_i{}^j+\gamma_1\left[ge^{-w}r^2\left(v'a+a'\right)WQ^s\right](\sigma_s)_i{}^j\Big\}\epsilon_j=0 \tag{2.2.15}$$

The commutators between (2.2.8) and the angular components give the conditions

$$\Big\{\gamma_0\left[v'e^{-w}-g^2e^wrW^2\right]\delta_i{}^j-igr(v'a+a')WQ^s(\sigma_s)_i{}^j\gamma_1-i(v'a+a')e^{-w}\delta_i{}^j\Big\}\epsilon_j=0 \tag{2.2.16}$$

The commutators between (2.2.9) and the angular components give

$$\begin{aligned}&\Big\{-\frac{i}{2}g(v'a+a')rWQ^s(\sigma_s)_i{}^j\gamma_0+\left[\frac{1}{2}-w'e^{-w}-\frac{g^2}{2}e^wrW^2\right]\gamma_1\delta_i{}^j\\&+\frac{g}{2}rq'^XD_X\left(WQ^s\right)(\sigma_s)_i{}^j+\frac{i}{4}\partial_r\left[re^{-w}(v'a+a')\right]\gamma_0\gamma_1\delta_i{}^j\Big\}\epsilon_j=0\end{aligned} \tag{2.2.17}$$

Finally the commutator between (2.2.8) and (2.2.9) gives

$$\begin{aligned}&\Big\{igq'^XD_X\left(\sqrt{\frac{3}{2}}e^vaWQ^s\right)(\sigma_s)_i{}^j-\gamma_0\frac{g}{2}e^vq'^XD_X(WQ^s)(\sigma_s)_i{}^j\\&+\gamma_1\left[i\frac{v'}{2}e^{v-w}(v'a+a')\delta_i{}^j-\frac{i}{2}\partial_r\left(e^{v-w}(v'a+a')\right)\delta_i{}^j\right]\\&+\gamma_0\gamma_1\delta_i{}^j\left[\frac{1}{2}g^2e^{v+w}W^2+e^{v-w}\frac{1}{2}(v'a+a')^2-\frac{1}{2}\partial_r(v'e^{v-w})\right]\Big\}\epsilon_j=0\end{aligned} \tag{2.2.18}$$

We begin with the study of the equation in (2.2.15). Unless all coefficients vanish it can be written as

$$(if^0\gamma_0\delta_l{}^k+f^r(\sigma_r)_l{}^k\gamma_1)\epsilon_k=\epsilon_l \tag{2.2.19}$$

where

$$f^r=-ge^wrWQ^r \tag{2.2.20}$$

$$f^0=-\frac{1-e^{-2w}-\frac{r^2e^{-2w}}{4}(v'a+a')^2+g^2r^2W^2}{re^{-2w}(v'a+a')} \tag{2.2.21}$$

The Killing equation in (2.2.19), viewed as a projector equation, leads to the consistency requirement

$$(f^0)^2+\sum_r(f^r)^2=1 \tag{2.2.22}$$

Now we compare the above results with the content from the hyperini equation in (2.2.13). Starting from (2.2.13), multiplying by the projector $K_{\tilde{Z}}\delta_i{}^j-2iR^s_{\tilde{Z}X}K^X(\sigma_s)_i{}^j$ and symmetrizing in z, $\tilde{z}$, we obtain

$$\Bigg[\left(K_ZK_{\tilde{Z}}+4K^XK^YR^r_{ZX}R^s_{\tilde{Z}Y}\delta_{rs}\right)\left[a\gamma_0\delta_i{}^j-i\delta_i{}^j\right]-\Bigg(\sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}\frac{e^{-w}}{g}q'^Xg_{X(Z}K_{\tilde{Z})}\delta_i{}^j$$

$$+2\sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}i\frac{e^{-w}}{g}q'^X R^r_{(Z|X|}K_{\tilde{Z})}(\sigma_r)_i{}^j - 2\sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}i\frac{e^{-w}}{g}q'^X g_{X(Z}R^r_{\tilde{Z})Y}K^Y(\sigma_r)_i{}^j$$
$$+4\sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}\frac{e^{-w}}{g}q'^X R^r_{(Z|Y|}R^s_{\tilde{Z})X}K^Y\left(\delta_{rs}\delta_i{}^j + i\epsilon_{rst}(\sigma_r)_i{}^j\right)\Bigg)\gamma_1\Bigg]\epsilon_j = 0 \qquad (2.2.23)$$

The above equation is compatible with (2.2.19) only if the conditions

$$q'^X(g_{X(Z}K_{\tilde{Z})} - 4R^r_{X(Z}R^s_{\tilde{Z})Y}K^Y\delta_{rs}) = 0 \qquad (2.2.24)$$

are satisfied. If this is the case then (2.2.23) becomes

$$\left[-ia\gamma_0\delta_i{}^j - 2\sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}e^{-w}q'^X\frac{U^r_{XZ\tilde{Z}}}{g(K_Z K_{\tilde{Z}} + 4K^T K^Y R^r_{ZT}R^s_{\tilde{Z}Y}\delta_{rs})}\gamma_1(\sigma^r)_i{}^j\right]\epsilon_j = \epsilon_j \qquad (2.2.25)$$

with

$$U^r_{XZ\tilde{Z}} \equiv R^r_{(Z|X|}K_{\tilde{Z})} - g_{X(Z}R^r_{\tilde{Z})Y}K^Y + 2R^t_{X(Z}R^s_{\tilde{Z})Y}K^Y\epsilon_{tsr} \qquad (2.2.26)$$

The second term in (2.2.25) must be independent of Z and $\tilde{Z}$, so that one obtains

$$q'^X\frac{U^r_{XZ\tilde{Z}}}{K_Z K_{\tilde{Z}} + 4K^T K^Y R^t_{ZT}R^s_{\tilde{Z}Y}\delta_{ts}} = -\frac{q'^X D_X P^r}{|K|^2} = -\sqrt{\frac{3}{2}}\frac{ge^w}{2}f^r \qquad (2.2.27)$$

The above equations have important consequences for the geometry of the moduli space; we will discuss them in the next section.

At this point from the angular integrability condition and the hyperini supersymmetry variation we have

$$\sqrt{\frac{3}{2}}\,g^2e^{2w}rWQ^r = -2\frac{q'^X D_X P^r}{|K|^2} \qquad (2.2.28)$$
$$f^0 = -a \qquad (2.2.29)$$

The above result and the relation in (2.2.22) fix f^r to be

$$f^r = \pm\sqrt{1-a^2}Q^r \qquad (2.2.30)$$

In addition from the vector relation[3] (2.2.28) we have

$$q'^X D_X Q^r = 0 \qquad (2.2.31)$$
$$ge^w|K|^2\sqrt{1-a^2} = \pm 2W' \qquad (2.2.32)$$

---

[3] $Q^rQ_r = 1$ implies $(D_XQ^r)Q_r = 0$.

If we use (2.2.29) and (2.2.30) in (2.2.21) and (2.2.20) then we find

$$\sqrt{1-a^2} = \mp g e^{w} r W \tag{2.2.33}$$

$$a = \frac{1 - e^{-2w} - \frac{r^2 e^{-2w}}{4}(v'a + a')^2 + g^2 r^2 W^2}{r e^{-2w}(v'a + a')} \tag{2.2.34}$$

Finally inserting (2.2.33) into (2.2.34) we obtain

$$1 = a^2 e^{-2w}\left[1 + \frac{r}{2}\left(v' + \frac{a'}{a}\right)\right]^2 \tag{2.2.35}$$

We postpone the discussion of the other consistency conditions and analyze next the implications of what we have just found for the geometric structure of the moduli space.

2.2.2 Geometric restrictions

Now we want to consider the equations in (2.2.24) and (2.2.27) and show that they determine the space-time r-dependence of the scalars, i.e. of all the quantities that enter in the description of the quaternionic geometry like the prepotential P^r and the Killing vectors. In order to elucidate their meaning in a transparent manner it is convenient to proceed as follows. First a double contraction of (2.2.24) with the Killing vector leads to $q'^X K_X = 0$. Then using this result and contracting (2.2.24) with K^Z one obtains

$$q'^Z = \pm 3 g e^{w}\sqrt{1-a^2}\,\partial^Z W \tag{2.2.36}$$

The above equation is quite important: it describes the path in the moduli space associated to the BPS solution. It shows explicitly that, if we exclude the case $a^2 = 1$, the condition to have a fixed point is $\partial_Z W = 0$ which corresponds to a local minimum of the potential as observed in [20].

From (2.2.36) using $q'^Z W_Z = W'$ we obtain

$$|q'|^2 = \pm 3 g e^{w}\sqrt{1-a^2}\,W' \tag{2.2.37}$$

The contraction of (2.2.24) with q'^Z gives

$$|q'|^2 K_Z = 2\sqrt{6}\,\delta_{rs}\, q'^X R^r_{XZ} Q^s W' \tag{2.2.38}$$

Acting now with K^Z one obtains

$$|K|^2 |q'|^2 = 6 W'^2 \tag{2.2.39}$$

(2.2.39) together with (2.2.37) gives again (cfr 2.2.32)

$$|q'|^2 = \frac{3}{2}|K|^2 g^2 e^{2w}(1-a^2) \tag{2.2.40}$$

which is in agreement with the fact that the Killing vector K^X has to be null at the fixed point. Using (2.2.40) and (2.2.36) in (2.2.38) one easily obtains

$$K^Z = 2\sqrt{6}\delta_{rs}Q^r R^{sXZ}\partial_X W \tag{2.2.41}$$

Now we consider (2.2.27) rewritten as

$$|K|^2 q'^X U^r_{XZ\tilde{Z}} = -\left[K_Z K_{\tilde{Z}} + 4K^T K^Y R^t_{ZT} R^s_{\tilde{Z}Y}\delta_{ts}\right] q'^X D_X P^r \tag{2.2.42}$$

Contracting with $K^{\tilde{Z}}$ and using $K^X D_X P^s = 0$ (as follows from the definition (A.0.12)) we obtain

$$K^2 q'^X R^s_{ZX} = -\sqrt{\frac{3}{2}} W' Q^s K_Z - 3WW' Q^t D_Z Q^r \epsilon_{tr}{}^s \tag{2.2.43}$$

Moreover contracting (2.2.42) with $q'^{\tilde{Z}}$ and using (2.2.39) we find

$$|q'|^2 \partial^Z W = q'^Z W' \tag{2.2.44}$$

(which can be obtained also from (2.2.40) and (2.2.41)) and

$$|q'|^2 W D_Z Q^r + 2R^t_{ZX} W' q'^X Q^s \epsilon_{ts}{}^r = 0 \tag{2.2.45}$$

which after use of (2.2.43) gives (2.2.39).
Note that (A.0.12) gives

$$K^Z = -\frac{4}{3} R^{rZX} D_X P^r \tag{2.2.46}$$

so that (2.2.41) can be written as

$$K_Z = \sqrt{6} W R^{rX}{}_Z D_X Q_r \tag{2.2.47}$$

Finally the contraction of (2.2.43) with $Q^r \epsilon_{srt}$ gives

$$3WW' D_Z Q_t = |K|^2 Q^r q'^X R^s_{ZX} \epsilon_{srt} \tag{2.2.48}$$

Note that from (2.2.36) and (2.2.37) we also have

$$|\partial W|^2 = \frac{|K|^2}{6} \tag{2.2.49}$$

Let us collect the main results:

$$q'^Z = \pm 3ge^w \sqrt{1-a^2}\partial^Z W \tag{2.2.50}$$

$$|K|^2 |q'|^2 = 6W'^2 \tag{2.2.51}$$

$$|q'|^2 K_Z = 2\sqrt{6}\delta_{rs} q'^X R^r_{XZ} Q^s W' \tag{2.2.52}$$

$$K^Z = 2\sqrt{6}\delta_{rs} Q^r R^{sXZ}\partial_X W \tag{2.2.53}$$

$$K^2 q'^X R^s_{ZX} = -\sqrt{\frac{3}{2}} W' Q^s K_Z - 3WW' Q^t D_Z Q^r \epsilon_{tr}^{\ s} \tag{2.2.54}$$

From the above relations it follows

$$
\begin{aligned}
&|q'|^2 = \frac{3}{2}|K|^2 g^2 e^{2w}(1-a^2) && (2.2.55)\\
&K_Z = \sqrt{6} W R^{rX}{}_Z D_X Q_r && (2.2.56)\\
&|\partial W|^2 = \frac{|K|^2}{6} && (2.2.57)\\
&3WW' D_Z Q_t = |K|^2 Q^r q'^X R^s_{ZX}\epsilon_{srt} && (2.2.58)\\
&K_X q'^X = 0 && (2.2.59)
\end{aligned}
$$

Now it is straightforward to verify that these conditions solve (2.2.24), (2.2.27) and (2.2.13) identically. Finally we note that (2.2.59) gives

$$q'^X D_X Q^r = 0 \tag{2.2.60}$$

It is interesting and not at all obvious that (2.2.36) and the other relations we have found in this section look like a simple generalization of those obtained for flat domain wall solutions (where the gauge fields are zero). This is suggestive of an underlying general structure, independent of the form of the space-time solution.

2.2.3 Further restrictions

The equations obtained in the previous subsection are quite general. Now we have to consider the other integrability conditions together with (2.2.19). We start from (2.2.16): it is easy to show that either all the coefficients vanish or it must be equivalent to (2.2.19). The first case reduces to the case in which all the coefficients of (2.2.19) vanish. The second case is verified when the following conditions are true:

$$f^0 = -\frac{v' - g^2 e^{2w} r W^2}{(v'a + a')} \tag{2.2.61}$$

$$f^r = -g e^w r W Q^r \tag{2.2.62}$$

Other consequences of (2.2.16) are the following:
from (2.2.61) and (2.2.21) we find

$$1 + 2g^2 r^2 W^2 + \frac{r^2 e^{-2w}}{4}\left[v'^2 - (v'a + a')^2\right] = \left(1 + \frac{r}{2}v'\right)^2 e^{-2w} \tag{2.2.63}$$

while inserting (2.2.33) into (2.2.61) we obtain

$$a = \frac{rv' - 1 + a^2}{r(v'a + a')} \tag{2.2.64}$$

Now we consider the integrability condition (2.2.17): by means of (2.2.19) we obtain the equations[4]

$$gr(v'a + a')W + garW' \mp \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{1-a^2}\,\partial_r[re^{-w}(v'a + a')] = 0 \tag{2.2.65}$$

---

[4] These two equations give again the condition (2.2.60).

$$\mp gr(v'a+a')\sqrt{1-a^2}W - aw'e^{-w} - g^2ae^wrW^2 + \frac{1}{2}\partial_r[re^{-w}(v'a+a')] = 0 \tag{2.2.66}$$

Similarly from (2.2.18) we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mp\sqrt{1-a^2}Q^s\left[\frac{1}{2}g^2e^{v+w}W^2 + \frac{1}{2}e^{v-w}(v'a+a')^2 - \frac{1}{2}\partial_r(v'e^{v-w})\right]&\\ - g^2aq'^XD_X\left(\sqrt{\frac{3}{2}}e^vaP^s\right) + \frac{g}{2}e^vW'Q^s = 0& \qquad (2.2.67)\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\mp g\sqrt{1-a^2}e^vW' + ae^v\partial_r\left[e^{-w}\big(v'a+a'\big)\right] + g^2e^{v+w}W^2&\\ + e^{v-w}\big(v'a+a'\big)^2 - \partial_r\big(v'e^{v-w}\big) = 0& \qquad (2.2.68)\end{aligned}$$

In the next section we analyze the system of first order differential equations obtained above.

2.3 Static BPS configurations

Let us begin with equation (2.2.64) from which we easily obtain

$$e^v = \frac{r}{r_0\sqrt{1-a^2}} \tag{2.3.1}$$

where r_0 is an integration constant. Using (2.2.33) this can be rewritten as

$$1 = \mp gr_0We^{v+w} \tag{2.3.2}$$

We focus on the equations derived in the previous section to obtain a set of independent ones. We start with the equation (2.2.65). Using (2.3.1) we find

$$\partial_r\left(gae^vW \mp \frac{r}{2r_0}e^{-w}(v'a+a')\right) = 0 \tag{2.3.3}$$

It is straightforward to verify that (2.3.3) is satisfied by (2.3.2) and (2.2.35). Thus (2.2.65) is identically satisfied.

Now we turn to the analysis of the equation (2.2.66). Using

$$rv'a + ra' = a - \frac{ra'}{a^2-1} \tag{2.3.4}$$

it becomes

$$\partial_r\left(ae^{-w} + \frac{1}{2}re^{-w}(v'a+a')\right) = 0 \tag{2.3.5}$$

which is solved by (2.2.35). Thus we conclude that the equation (2.2.66) is identically satisfied. We notice that also the equation (2.2.63) is identically satisfied. Indeed (2.2.35) gives

$$1 - \frac{r^2}{4}e^{-2w}(v'a+a')^2 = a^2e^{-2w} + ae^{-2w}r(v'a+a') \tag{2.3.6}$$

Inserting this expression into (2.2.63) we obtain

$$2g^2r^2W^2 - e^{-2w}(1+rv') + ae^{-2w}r(v'a+a') + a^2e^{-2w} = 0 \tag{2.3.7}$$

Using (2.2.33) in the first term and multiplying by e^{2w} we have

$$1 - a^2 - rv' + ar(v'a+a') = 0 \tag{2.3.8}$$

which is equivalent to (2.3.1).

In a similar way we can study the equation (2.2.68). If we use (2.2.33) in the first term of (2.2.68) we have

$$\begin{aligned} g^2e^{v+w}rWW' + g^2e^{v+w}W^2 + ae^v\partial_r\big(e^{-w}\big(v'a+a'\big)\big) \\ + e^{v-w}\big(v'a+a'\big)^2 - \partial_r\big(v'e^{v-w}\big) = 0 \end{aligned} \tag{2.3.9}$$

This can be rewritten in the form

$$g^2e^{v+w}rWW' + g^2e^{v+w}W^2 + \partial_r(ae^{v-w}(v'a+a') - v'e^{v-w}) = 0 \tag{2.3.10}$$

If we now multiply by r and then add and subtract the quantity $e^{v-w}(a(v'a+a')-v')$ and finally use (2.3.8) we find

$$g^2\frac{e^{v+w}}{2}\partial_r(r^2W^2) - e^{v-w}(a(v'a+a')-v') + \partial_r(e^{v-w}(a^2-1)) = 0 \tag{2.3.11}$$

Now we use $g^2r^2W^2 = (1-a^2)e^{-2w}$ and obtain

$$\frac{e^{v+w}}{2}\partial_r[(1-a^2)e^{-2w}] - e^{v-w}(a(v'a+a')-v') + \partial_r(e^{v-w}(a^2-1)) = 0 \tag{2.3.12}$$

This shows that (2.2.68) is identically satisfied.

At the end we consider the equation (2.2.67). Using (2.2.14) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \pm\sqrt{1-a^2}\left[\frac{1}{2}g^2e^{v+w}W^2 + \frac{1}{2}e^{v-w}\big(v'a+a'\big)^2 - \frac{1}{2}\partial_r\left(v'e^{v-w}\right)\right] \\ + \frac{3}{2}ga\partial_r\left(ae^vW\right) + \frac{g}{2}e^vW' = 0 \end{aligned} \tag{2.3.13}$$

By means of (2.2.68) this can be written as

$$-3ga\partial_r\left(ae^vW\right) + ga^2e^vW' \pm a\sqrt{1-a^2}e^v\partial_r\left(e^{-w}\left(v'a+a'\right)\right) = 0 \tag{2.3.14}$$

From (2.2.33) we have $\mp gW = \sqrt{1-a^2}\frac{e^{-w}}{r}$ so that

$$\pm gW' = \frac{aa'}{\sqrt{1-a^2}}\frac{e^{-w}}{r} + \frac{\sqrt{1-a^2}}{r^2}e^{-w} - \frac{\sqrt{1-a^2}}{r}\partial_re^{-w} \tag{2.3.15}$$

and then

$$\begin{aligned}
&gae^vW' \pm \sqrt{1-a^2}e^v\partial_r(e^{-w}(v'a+a')) = \\
&\qquad \pm\frac{v'a}{r}\sqrt{1-a^2}e^{v-w} \mp \frac{a}{r}\sqrt{1-a^2}e^v\partial_r e^{-w} \pm \sqrt{1-a^2}e^v\partial_r\left(e^{-w}\left(v'a+a'\right)\right) \\
&\qquad = \pm\frac{\sqrt{1-a^2}}{r}\left(re^v\partial_r(e^{-w}(v'a+a')) + e^v v'ae^{-w} - ae^v\partial_r e^{-w}\right) \\
&\qquad = \pm\frac{\sqrt{1-a^2}}{r}e^v\left(-a\partial_r e^{-w} - e^{-w}a' + \partial_r(re^{-w}(v'a+a'))\right) \\
&\qquad = \mp\frac{\sqrt{1-a^2}}{r}e^v\partial_r\left(ae^{-w} - re^{-w}(v'a+a')\right) = \mp\frac{3}{r_0}\partial_r\left(ae^{-w}\right)
\end{aligned} \tag{2.3.16}$$

where in the last step we have used (2.2.35) and (2.3.1).
Then using $\frac{e^{-w}}{r_0} = \mp g_R e^v W$ we see that (2.3.14) is identically satisfied.

In the next section we verify that BPS solutions we have obtained so far satisfy the equations of motion.

2.4 Equations of motion

The equations of motion of our system are given by

$$\begin{aligned}
&-e^{v-w}\partial_r(v'e^{v-w}) - 3\frac{v'}{r}e^{2(v-w)} + e^{2(v-w)}(v'a+a')^2 + 4g^2e^{2v}W^2 \\
&\qquad\qquad - \frac{1}{2}g^2e^{2v}|K|^2 + \frac{3}{2}g^2e^{2v}|K|^2a^2 = 0
\end{aligned} \tag{2.4.1}$$

$$e^{w-v}\partial_r(v'e^{v-w}) - \frac{3}{r}w' + |q'|^2 - (v'a+a')^2 - \frac{1}{2}e^{2w}(8g^2W^2 + g^2|K|^2) = 0 \tag{2.4.2}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&re^{-2w}\big(v'-w'\big) - 2\big(1-e^{-2w}\big) + \frac{1}{2}r^2e^{-2w}\big(v'a+a'\big)^2 \\
&\qquad\qquad + \frac{2}{3}r^2\left(-6g^2W^2 + \frac{3}{4}g^2|K|^2\right) = 0
\end{aligned} \tag{2.4.3}$$

$$ae^vK_Xq'^X = 0 \tag{2.4.4}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&e^{-(v+w)}r^{-3}\partial_r\left(r^3e^{v-w}q'^Z\right) - \frac{1}{2}\partial^Z g_{XY}e^{-2w}q'^Xq'^Y \\
&\qquad\qquad + \frac{3}{4}g^2a^2\partial^Z|K|^2 - \partial^Z\left(-6g^2W^2 + \frac{3}{4}g^2|K|^2\right) = 0
\end{aligned} \tag{2.4.5}$$

$$3e^{-2w}(v'a+a') + r\partial_r(e^{-w}(v'a+a')) = grae^w|K|^2 \tag{2.4.6}$$

$$ge^{-2w}K_Xq'^X = 0 \tag{2.4.7}$$

where (2.4.1), (2.4.2), (2.4.3) and (2.4.4) are the Einstein equations, (2.4.5) is the equation for the scalar fields and (2.4.6), (2.4.7) are the Maxwell equations.

First we observe that both (2.4.4) and (2.4.7) are an immediate consequence of (2.2.59). Then we consider the sum of (2.4.1) and (2.4.2). Multiplying by $e^{2(v-w)}$ and using (2.2.55) we obtain

$$g^2|K|^2 = 2\frac{e^{-2w}}{r}(v' + w')\ . \tag{2.4.8}$$

This is solved by (2.3.2), (2.2.33) and (2.2.32).

It is straightforward to check that all the equations are indeed satisfied:
Equation (2.4.1) is solved using (2.4.8), (2.3.9), (2.3.2), (2.2.33), (2.2.35) and (2.3.1).
Equation (2.4.3) is solved by (2.4.8) and (2.2.63).
Equation (2.4.5) is solved using (2.2.50), (2.4.8), (2.2.57), (2.2.33) and (2.3.1).
Finally (2.4.6) is solved by (2.2.35) and (2.4.8).

2.5 The Universal Hypermultiplet case

Now we collect the set of first order differential equations obtained by the BPS conditions:

$$1 = a^2 e^{-2w}\left[1 + \frac{r}{2}\left(v' + \frac{a'}{a}\right)\right]^2 \tag{2.5.1}$$

$$e^v = \frac{r}{r_0\sqrt{1-a^2}} \tag{2.5.2}$$

$$\sqrt{1-a^2} = \mp g e^w r W \tag{2.5.3}$$

$$q'^Z = \pm 3 g e^w \sqrt{1-a^2}\,\partial^Z W \tag{2.5.4}$$

It is easy to reduce the above system to

$$\begin{cases} q'^Z = -3\frac{1-a^2}{r}\partial^Z \ln W \\ 1-a^2 = \frac{g^2}{4}\left(3a + r\frac{a'}{1-a^2}\right)^2 r^2 W^2 \end{cases} \tag{2.5.5}$$

(2.5.2) and (2.5.3) simply define v and w respectively in terms of a and of the scalars, hence as functions of r.

In this form our problem is analogous to the domain-wall case: the main difference is that now the two differential equations are coupled equations and therefore finding an explicit solution is more involved. To solve (2.5.5) we have to specify W as a function of the scalars q^X i.e we have to choose which isometry of the quaternionic manifold represents the action of the $U(1)$ gauge symmetry. As we have already argued in the previous sections the most interesting configurations are obtained for isometries in the isotropy group of some point of the quaternionic manifold. By definition this choice corresponds to a fixed point solution i.e one with asymptotic constant scalars. For (supersymmetric) black hole solutions it implies the existence of an horizon. The scale invariance appearing in the near-horizon limit gives rise to the enhancement of the unbroken supersymmetry associated to a fixed point.

In fact the configurations that have the most relevant role in the AdS/CFT correspondence are the ones with two fixed points: this type of solutions should describe a RG flow between two different CFT's defined on the boundary of the five dimensional space-time. For black hole solutions this means that the space-time is maximally symmetric in the $r \to \infty$ limit (for example AdS). Since as shown in [72], in order to obtain such configurations one needs the introduction of vector multiplets, we postpone the study of black hole configurations to future work.[5]

Here, as an example, we construct an explicit solution of the BPS equations in the case of a $n_H = 1$ hypermultiplet, i.e. the so called universal hypermultiplet. However, this simple example is important because this hypermultiplet (which contains the Calabi-Yau volume) appears in any Calabi-Yau compactification. We adopt for this manifold the notations and the coordinate system of [20]. The main properties of this space are reviewed in the appendix A. For simplicity we make the following choices for the gauged isometry and the graviphoton:

$$K \equiv \vec{k}_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \tag{2.5.6}$$

$$a' \equiv 0 \tag{2.5.7}$$

The Killing vector $\vec{k}_1$ has a simple interpretation: it represents the translation of the axionic scalar (σ in our notations). This solution has been already considered in [27][6]. We remark that since $\vec{k}_1$ is not in the isotropy group of any point of the manifold, the presence of fixed points is excluded. In general it is easy to see that fixed point solutions are ruled out by the assumption $a' = 0$.

We observe that, being the superpotential for $\vec{k}_1$, $W_{\vec{k}_1} = \mp\sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}\frac{1}{4V}$, the only dynamical scalar is V. The others are space-time constants and can be set consistently equal to zero. Imposing (2.5.6) and (2.5.7) the system (2.5.5) becomes

$$\begin{cases} V' = 6\frac{1-a^2}{r}V \\ \frac{1-a^2}{a^2} = \frac{3}{32}\left(\frac{gr}{V}\right)^2 \end{cases} \tag{2.5.8}$$

Since the metric of the quaternionic manifold (A.0.19) in our parametrization is singular for $V = 0$ we restrict ourselves to the branch $V > 0$. From (2.5.8) it follows that the scalar V has the form

$$V = \mathcal{C}\, r^{\Lambda} \tag{2.5.9}$$

with $\mathcal{C}$ and $\Lambda = 6(1 - a^2)$ fixed, by consistency with (2.5.8), to be

$$\Lambda = 1 \tag{2.5.10}$$

$$\mathcal{C} = \sqrt{\frac{3}{32}}\sqrt{\frac{a^2}{1-a^2}}g \tag{2.5.11}$$

---

[5] The results presented in the ch.3 furnish the instruments to affort it.

[6] As discussed in section 2.2 in [27] a mistake affects the calculations; however the final solution has the right functional form.

that in particular gives $a = \sqrt{\frac{5}{6}}$. At the end we find

$$V = \sqrt{\frac{15}{32}} g r \tag{2.5.12}$$

and using (2.5.2) and (2.5.3)

$$e^v = \sqrt{6} \frac{r}{r_0} \tag{2.5.13}$$

$$e^w = \sqrt{\frac{15}{8}} \tag{2.5.14}$$

Rescaling the time coordinate t by the constant $\frac{\sqrt{6}}{r_0}$ the space-time metric and the electrostatic potential become

$$ds^2 = -r^2 dt^2 + \frac{15}{8} dr^2 + r^2 (d\theta^2 + \sin^2\theta d\phi^2 + \cos^2\theta d\psi^2) \tag{2.5.15}$$

$$A_t = \sqrt{\frac{5}{4}} r \tag{2.5.16}$$

We notice that as expected the gauging constant g appears only in the quaternionic scalar while the other space-time quantities do not depend on it.

2.6 Discussion and Outlook

Here we have presented electrostatic spherical BPS ($\mathcal{N} = 1$) solutions in $\mathcal{N} = 2$ gauged supergravity in five dimensions with hypermultiplet couplings. In particular we have discussed the possibility of finding (extreme) black-hole solutions. Although we study BPS solutions following the "traditional" way i.e fixing an ansatz of interest we get general indications useful for the program of this thesis. The main results we have obtained can be summarized as follows: first of all we have derived the BPS equations in a general setting, going beyond special cases treated previously with restrictive ansatz [27].

Then we have discussed the structure of the integrability conditions and in particular of the hyperini equations. We have obtained relations which appear to be a generalization of those found in [20] for flat domain walls. This result is somewhat surprising since our ansatz is quite different from the one in [20]. In addition we have considered a configuration with a non-vanishing gauge field whose presence complicates considerably the structure of the equations.

We have verified that our BPS solutions satisfy the equations of motion.

The above results leave much space for further studies. First of all it would be interesting to explore if and under which conditions the structure found for the hyperini equation is maintained when more general ansatz are considered and vector multiplets are introduced. These two points will discussed in the following chapters. In these general settings one would like to explore the existence of black hole solutions leading to nontrivial RG flows.

Finally it would be interesting to consider such explicit solutions and extend them to non extreme black holes along the lines of what has been done for the case of vector multiplets [73].

These open problems are currently under investigation.

Chapter 3

The addition of vector multiplets

3.1 Introduction

In this chapter we generalize what it has been done in [28], with the introduction of an arbitrary number of vector multiplets considering only abelian gauge groups ($(U(1)^{n_V+1})$). This extention is necessary to consider configurations with two fixed points and it can be useful to understand which new features arise when considering charged solutions in presence of both hypermultiplet and vector multiplet couplings. We derive integrability conditions for this case using the same ansatz of [28] for the metric and for the gauge fields and study them together with the hyperini and gaugini equations. As for the flat domain configurations of [20] we obtain that the BPS conditions ensure the stability of the potential as shown in [67],[74] and that the supersymmetric flow equations are controlled by the superpotential W. The set of differential equations we get has a structure analogous to the sub-case $n_V = 0$ treated in the previous chapter: in particular we find also for the scalars of very special geometry the behavior $\varphi'^{\Lambda} \propto \partial_{\Lambda} W$ (where with this notation we indicate generically all the scalars) as in [20].[1]. We explicitly show that the BPS conditions satisfy the equations of motion (to not tire the reader the calculations are given in the appendix). At the end we present a preliminary discussion of the possible applications of our results.

3.2 The model and its BPS equations

We consider $\mathcal{N}$=2 supergravity in five dimensions with an arbitrary number of hypermultiplets and vector multiplets. The field content of the theory is the following:

---

[1] As it will be emphasized later on, the factor of proportionality is not longer the same for vector multiplet and hypermultiplet scalars.

- the supergravity multiplet

$$\{e^a_\mu\ , \psi^{\alpha i}_\mu\ , A^0_\mu\} \tag{3.2.1}$$

containing the *graviton* e^a_μ, two *gravitini* $\psi^{\alpha i}_\mu$ and the *graviphoton* A^0_μ;

- n_H hypermultiplets

$$\{\zeta^A\ , q^X\} \tag{3.2.2}$$

containing the *hyperini* ζ^A with $A = 1, 2, \dots, 2n_H$, and the *scalars* q^X with $X = 1, 2, \dots, 4n_H$ which define a quaternionic Kahler manifold with metric g_{XY};

- the vector multiplet

$$\{A^{\hat{I}}_\mu\ , \lambda^{ai}\ , \phi^x\} \tag{3.2.3}$$

containing n_V *gaugini* λ^{ia} , $\quad a = 1, \dots, n_V$ with spin $\frac{1}{2}$, n_V real scalars ϕ^x, $x = 1, \dots, n_V$ which define a very special manifold and n_V *gauge vectors* $A^{\hat{I}}_\mu$, $\hat{I} = 1 \dots, n_V$. Usually the graviphoton is included by taking $I = 0 \dots n_V$.

The bosonic sector of the gauged Lagrangian density is given by [5]

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}_{BOS} &= \frac{1}{2}e\{R - \frac{1}{2}a_{IJ}F^I_{\mu\nu}F^{J\mu\nu} - g_{XY}D_\mu q^X D^\mu q^Y - g_{xy}D_\mu\phi^x D^\mu\phi^y - 2g^2\mathcal{V}(q,\phi)\} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{6\sqrt{6}}\epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma\tau}C_{IJK}F^I_{\mu\nu}F^J_{\rho\sigma}A^K_\tau \end{aligned} \tag{3.2.4}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} D_\mu q^X &= \partial_\mu q^X + gA^I_\mu K^X_I(q) \\ D_\mu\phi^x &= \partial_\mu\phi^x + gA^I_\mu K^x_I(\phi) \end{aligned}$$

where $K^X_I(q)$, $K^x_I(\phi)$ are the Killing vector on the quaternionic and the very special real manifold respectively and $\mathcal{V}(q,\phi)$ is the scalar potential as given in Appendix.

At this point we concentrate our attention to abelian case: this implies (see sect. 1.4.2) that the action of the gauge group is non trivial only on the quaternionic manifold while scalars of vector multiplet are uncharged under it. This means that $D_\mu\phi^x \equiv \partial_\mu\phi^x$ and the existence of any isometry for the very special geometry is not required. Then the variations of the fermions for abelian gauge symmetry $U(1)^{n_V+1}$ reduce to:
for the gravitini

$$\begin{aligned}\delta_\epsilon\psi_{\mu i} &= \partial_\mu\epsilon_i + \frac{1}{4}\omega^{ab}_\mu\gamma_{ab}\epsilon_i - \partial_\mu q^X p_{Xi}{}^j\epsilon_j + gA^I_\mu P_{Ii}{}^j\epsilon_j \\ &+ \frac{i}{4\sqrt{6}}(\gamma_{\mu\nu\rho} - 4g_{\mu\nu}\gamma_\rho)h_I F^{I\nu\rho}\epsilon_i - \frac{i}{\sqrt{6}}gh^I P_{Ii}{}^j\gamma_\mu\epsilon_j = 0 \end{aligned} \tag{3.2.5}$$

for gaugini

$$\Big[-i\phi'^{x}e^{-w}\gamma_1\delta_i{}^j - 2igh^{Ix}P_I^s(\sigma_s)_i{}^j \\ +\sqrt{\frac{3}{2}}e^{-w}h_I^x\left(v'a^I + a^{I'}\right)\gamma_{01}\delta_i{}^j\Big]\epsilon_j = 0 \tag{3.2.6}$$

and for hyperini

$$f_{iX}^A\left[-iq'^{X}e^{-w}\gamma_1 + i\sqrt{\frac{3}{2}}ga^IK_I^X\gamma_0 + \sqrt{\frac{3}{2}}gh^IK_I^X\right]\epsilon^i = 0 \tag{3.2.7}$$

where we have set $\phi'^x := \partial_r\phi^x$ and $q'^X := \partial_r q^X$.[2]

As already explained at the begining, we want to consider the direct generalization of the problem considered in the chap.2 We look for electrostatic spherical solutions that preserve half of the $\mathcal{N} = 2$ supersymmetries. We choose the same metric of the previous chapter, which is $SO(4)$ symmetric with all the other fields that only depend on the holographic space-time coordinate r. Moreover we fix the gauge for the gauge fields keeping only the A_t^I component different from zero.

Introducing spherical coordinates $(t, r, \theta, \phi, \psi)$ we write

$$ds^2 = -e^{2v}dt^2 + e^{2w}dr^2 + r^2(d\theta^2 + \sin^2\theta d\phi^2 + \cos^2\theta d\psi^2) \tag{3.2.8}$$

where the functions v and w depend on r only.

We parametrize the vector fields as

$$A_t^I = \sqrt{\frac{3}{2}}a^I(r)e^v \tag{3.2.9}$$

so that

$$A_t'^I = \sqrt{\frac{3}{2}}\left(v'a^I + a^{I'}\right)e^v \tag{3.2.10}$$

3.2.1 Integrability conditions

We now consider the BPS equations for the gravitini: their integrability condition is the vanishing of their commutators; using the general formulas in [35] one finds only four independent commutators

$$\Big\{\left[-\frac{1}{2}\partial_r(v'e^{v-w}) + \frac{1}{2}e^{v-w}(v'a + a')^2 + \frac{g^2}{2}e^{v+w}W^2\right]\gamma_0\gamma_1\delta_i{}^j \\ -\sqrt{\frac{3}{2}}ige^v(v'a^I + a^{I'})P_I^s(\sigma_s)_i{}^j - \sqrt{\frac{3}{2}}ige^va^I\tilde{D}_rP_I^s(\sigma_s)_i{}^j - \frac{g}{\sqrt{6}}e^v\tilde{D}_rP^s(\sigma_s)_i{}^j\gamma_0$$

---

[2] This notation applies to all the quantities with the only exception of a^I for which we explicitly define $a' \equiv (\partial_r a^I)h_I$. This choice is motivated by the aim to be manifest the similarities with the case $n_V = 0$.

$$
- \left[\frac{i}{2} \partial_r (e^{-w}(v'a + a')) e^v {\delta_i}^j + g^2 e^{v+w} a^I h^J P_I^r P_J^s {\epsilon_{rs}}^t {(\sigma_t)_i}^j \right] \gamma_1 \Big\} \epsilon_j = 0 \tag{3.2.11}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\left\{ \left[-\frac{1}{2} v' e^{v-2w} + \frac{g^2}{2} r e^v W^2 \right] \gamma_0 {\delta_i}^j + \frac{ig}{\sqrt{6}} r e^{v-w} (v'a + a') P^s {(\sigma_s)_i}^j \gamma_1 \right. \\
&\left. + \left[\frac{i}{2} e^{v-2w} (v'a + a') {\delta_i}^j + g^2 r e^v a^I h^J P_I^r P_J^s \epsilon_{rst} {(\sigma^t)_i}^j \right] \right\} \epsilon_j = 0
\end{aligned} \tag{3.2.12}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\left\{ \left[\frac{1}{2} \partial_r (e^{-w}) - \frac{g^2}{2} r e^w W^2 \right] \gamma_1 {\delta_i}^j + \frac{i}{4} \partial_r \left[r e^{-w} (v'a + a') \right] \gamma_0 \gamma_1 {\delta_i}^j \right. \\
&\left. - \frac{ig}{\sqrt{6}} r (v'a + a') P^s {(\sigma_s)_i}^j \gamma_0 + \frac{ig}{\sqrt{6}} r \tilde{D}_r P^s {(\sigma_s)_i}^j \right\} \epsilon_j = 0
\end{aligned} \tag{3.2.13}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\left\{ \frac{1}{2} \left[1 - e^{-2w} - \frac{r^2 e^{-2w}}{4} (v'a + a')^2 + \frac{2}{3} g^2 r^2 W^2 \right] {\delta_i}^j + \frac{i}{2} r e^{-2w} (v'a + a') {\delta_i}^j \gamma_0 \right. \\
&\left. + \frac{ig}{\sqrt{6}} r^2 e^{-w} (v'a + a') P^s {(\sigma_s)_i}^j \gamma_0 \gamma_1 \right\} \sin\theta \epsilon_j = 0
\end{aligned} \tag{3.2.14}
$$

with the scalar derivative defined as

$$
\tilde{D}_\mu = \partial_\mu \phi'^x \partial_x + \partial_\mu q'^X D_X
$$

Here we have defined $a := h_I a^I$ and $a' := h_I a^{I'}$.

3.2.2 Matter field conditions: Hyperini equation

Now we compare the information coming from the integrability condition with the supersymmetric variation of the matter fermions. We consider first the equation for the hyperini. Assuming that

$$
r e^{-2w} (v'a + a') \neq 0 \tag{3.2.15}
$$

we can rewrite (3.2.14) in the form

$$
(i f^0 \gamma_0 {\delta_l}^k + f^r {(\sigma_r)_l}^k \gamma_1) \epsilon_k = \epsilon_l \tag{3.2.16}
$$

with

$$
f^r = -g r e^w W Q^r \tag{3.2.17}
$$

$$
f^0 = -\frac{1 - e^{-2w} - \left(\frac{r e^{-w}}{2} (v'a + a') \right)^2 + g^2 r^2 W^2}{r e^{-2w} (v'a + a')} \tag{3.2.18}
$$

Also if we define $\Lambda = -f^0$ we have

$$
f^r = \pm \sqrt{1 - \Lambda^2} Q^r \tag{3.2.19}
$$

Put in (3.2.7) and using (A.0.6) we have

$$[iA\delta_l{}^k + B^s(\sigma_s)_l{}^k]\gamma_1\epsilon_k = [C\delta_l{}^k + iD^s(\sigma_s)_l{}^k]\epsilon_k \tag{3.2.20}$$

with

$$A = +\frac{1}{2}q'^Z e^{-w} f^0 + \sqrt{\frac{3}{2}}ga^I D^Z P^s_I f_s \tag{3.2.21}$$

$$B^s = +\frac{1}{2}\sqrt{\frac{3}{2}}ga^I K^Z_I f^s - q'^X R^{sZ}{}_X e^{-w} f^0 - \sqrt{\frac{3}{2}}ga^I D^Z P_r f_t \epsilon^{rts} \tag{3.2.22}$$

$$C = \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{\frac{3}{2}}a^I K^Z_I g + \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{\frac{3}{2}}f^0 g K^Z \tag{3.2.23}$$

$$D^s = \sqrt{\frac{3}{2}}ga^I D^Z P^s_I + g\sqrt{\frac{3}{2}}h^I D^Z P^s_I f^0 \tag{3.2.24}$$

It is now easy to see that this condition is not compatible with (3.2.16) so that one must put $A = B^s = C = D^s = 0$ that is

$$q'^Z e^{-w}\Lambda = \sqrt{6}ga^I D^Z P^s_I f_s \tag{3.2.25}$$

$$q'^X R^{sZ}{}_X e^{-w}\Lambda = -\frac{1}{2}\sqrt{\frac{3}{2}}ga^I K^Z_I f^s + \sqrt{\frac{3}{2}}ga^I D^Z P_{Ir} f_t \epsilon^{rts} \tag{3.2.26}$$

$$a^I K^Z_I = K^Z\Lambda \tag{3.2.27}$$

$$a^I D^Z P^s_I = h^I D^Z P^s_I \Lambda \tag{3.2.28}$$

Using (3.2.27) and (3.2.28) in (3.2.25) and (3.2.26) we find

$$q'_Z = \pm 3ge^w\sqrt{1-\Lambda^2}\partial_Z W \tag{3.2.29}$$

$$q'^X R^{sZ}{}_X e^{-w} = \mp\sqrt{1-\Lambda^2}\sqrt{\frac{3}{2}}g\left(\frac{1}{2}K^Z Q^s + \sqrt{\frac{3}{2}}WD^Z Q_r Q_t \epsilon^{rst}\right) \tag{3.2.30}$$

After contraction of (3.2.30) with K_Z we obtain

$$\sqrt{\frac{3}{2}}g^2 re^{2w} WQ^r = -2\frac{q'^X D_X P^r}{|K|^2} \tag{3.2.31}$$

which gives

$$q'^X D_X Q^r = 0 \tag{3.2.32}$$

$$ge^w|K|^2\sqrt{1-\Lambda^2} = \pm 2q'^X \partial_X W \tag{3.2.33}$$

Also (3.2.18) and (3.2.17) can be rewritten as

$$\sqrt{1-\Lambda^2} = \mp gre^w W \tag{3.2.34}$$

$$\Lambda = \frac{1 - e^{-2w} - \left(\frac{re^{-w}}{2}(v'a + a')\right)^2 + g^2r^2W^2}{re^{-2w}(v'a + a')} \tag{3.2.35}$$

Using (3.2.34) in (3.2.35) we obtain

$$1 = \Lambda^2 e^{-2w}\left[1 + \frac{r}{2\Lambda}(v'a + a')\right]^2 \tag{3.2.36}$$

If we use (3.2.33) in (3.2.30), the last one becomes

$$K^2 q'^X R^s_{ZX} = -q'^X \partial_X W \left(\sqrt{\frac{3}{2}} Q^s K_Z + 3W Q^t D_Z Q^r \epsilon_{tr}{}^{s}\right) \tag{3.2.37}$$

Many other relations, which will be useful to check the equations of motion, follow from (3.2.29), (3.2.32), (3.2.33) and (3.2.37):

$$|K|^2 |q'|^2 = 6\left(q'^X \partial_X W\right)^2 \tag{3.2.38}$$
$$|q'|^2 K_Z = 2\sqrt{6}\delta_{rs} q'^X R^r_{XZ} Q^s q'^Y \partial_Y W \tag{3.2.39}$$
$$K^Z = 2\sqrt{6}\delta_{rs} Q^r R^{sXZ} \partial_X W \tag{3.2.40}$$
$$|q'|^2 = \frac{3}{2}|K|^2 g^2 e^{2w}(1-\Lambda^2) \tag{3.2.41}$$
$$K_Z = \sqrt{6} W R^{rX}{}_Z D_X Q_r \tag{3.2.42}$$
$$|\partial W|^2 = \frac{|K|^2}{6} \tag{3.2.43}$$
$$3W q'^X \partial_X W D_Z Q_t = |K|^2 Q^r q'^X R^s_{ZX} \epsilon_{srt} \tag{3.2.44}$$

3.2.3 Matter field conditions: Gaugini equation

Next let us consider gaugini: using (3.2.16) to replace $\gamma_0\epsilon$ in (3.2.6) one easily obtains

$$\Lambda \phi'^x + \sqrt{\frac{3}{2}} h^x_I (v'a^I + a'^I) = 0 \tag{3.2.45}$$

$$2g\Lambda h^{xI} P^s_I - \sqrt{\frac{3}{2}} e^{-w} h^x_I (v'a^I + a^{I\prime}) f^s = 0 \tag{3.2.46}$$

which gives

$$\phi'^x f^s = -2g e^w h^{xI} P^s_I \tag{3.2.47}$$

and using

$$h^I_x P^s_I = -\frac{3}{2}\partial_x (W Q^s) \tag{3.2.48}$$

one finally has

$$\partial_x Q^s = 0 \tag{3.2.49}$$
$$\pm\sqrt{1-\Lambda^2}\,\phi'^x = 3g e^w g^{xy} \partial_y W \tag{3.2.50}$$
$$\sqrt{6} g \Lambda \partial_x W = \mp e^{-w} h^x_I (v'a^I + a'^I)\sqrt{1-\Lambda^2} \tag{3.2.51}$$

We can rewrite the information on the scalars in a compact way defining

$$\varphi^\Sigma = \begin{cases} \phi^x & \text{for } \Sigma = 1, ..., n_V \\ q^X & \text{for } \Sigma = n_V + 1, ..., n_V + 4n_H \end{cases}$$

as

$$\tilde{D}_r Q^s = 0 \tag{3.2.52}$$

$$\varphi'^\Lambda = \pm 3 g e^w \left(1 - \Lambda^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}\Delta} g^{\Lambda\Sigma} \partial_\Sigma W \tag{3.2.53}$$

with

$$\tag{3.2.54}$$

$$\Delta = \begin{cases} -1 & \text{for } \Lambda = 1, ..., n_V \\ 1 & \text{for } \Lambda = n_V + 1, ..., n_V + 4n_H \end{cases} \tag{3.2.55}$$

where $g^{\Lambda\Sigma}$ is simply the product metric.

Let me discuss the consequences of the above relations. First of all a strong similarity with the domain wall case [20] emerges again: this observation is a not trivial because the two configurations are quite different and it suggests that it should be possible to obtain a very general insight on BPS solutions in presence of generic matter couplings. To be more specific in the two situations it happens that the phase of prepotential Q^r do not depend on the vector multiplet scalars: under this condition the potential $\mathcal{V}(q, \phi)$ reduces the form that has been put forward for gravitational stability

$$\mathcal{V} = -6W^2 + \frac{9}{2} g^{\Lambda\Sigma} \partial_\Lambda W \partial_\Sigma W \tag{3.2.56}$$

It is easy to see that in this case critical points of W are also critical points of $\mathcal{V}$. Furthermore we find that $\varphi^\Lambda \propto \partial_\Lambda W$ but now the gauge interaction distinguishes between charged q^X and uncharged ϕ^x via the factor $1 - \Lambda^2$. At we end we want to underline the importance of (3.2.45) that practically gives the component of the field strength on h^I_x and with (2.2.64) determines it as a vector of special geometry. This information will be crucial to check whether BPS solutions satisfy the equations of motion.

3.2.4 Further restrictions

As usual we have to compare the previous information with the information coming from the other integrability conditions. Let us consider equation (3.2.12): it is easy to show that or all the coefficients vanish or it must be equivalent to (3.2.16). The first case reduces to the case in which all the coefficients of (3.2.14) vanish. The second case occurs when the following conditions are true:

$$f^0 = -\frac{v' - g^2 r e^{2w} W^2}{v' a + a'} \tag{3.2.57}$$

$$f^r = -g r e^w W Q^r \tag{3.2.58}$$

with $\underline{a^I P^r_I \text{ parallel to } h^J P^r_J}$

$$a^I P^r_I = \beta(r) h^J P^r_J \tag{3.2.59}$$

for some function β.

From the properties of very special geometry reviewed in the section 1.2.1 the modulus of vector h_I can be chosen $h_I h^I = 1$ so the set (h^I, h^I_x) is a base for the $n_V + 1-$dimensional space with $h_I h^I_x = 0$. Then this relation holds

$$a^I = a h^I + l^x h^I_x \tag{3.2.60}$$

Using the above decomposition in (3.2.28) and (3.2.59) we get

$$\begin{cases} (a-\Lambda) D_Z P^r = -l^x D_Z P^r_x \\ (a-\beta) P^r = -l^x P^r_x \end{cases} \tag{3.2.61}$$

remembering the BPS demand $\partial_x Q^r = 0$ gives

$$\begin{cases} \beta = \Lambda \\ a - \Lambda = \sqrt{\frac{3}{2}} l^x \partial_x \ln W = -\frac{r}{\sqrt{6}} l_x \phi'^x \\ a - \Lambda = \sqrt{\frac{3}{2}} l^x \partial_x \ln \partial_Z W \end{cases} \tag{3.2.62}$$

We continue to derive the other equations from integrability conditions.

Equation(3.2.57) together with (3.2.18) gives

$$1 + 2g^2 r^2 W^2 + \frac{r^2 e^{-2w}}{4} \left[v'^2 - (v'a + a')^2 \right] = e^{-2w} (1 + \frac{r}{2} v')^2 \tag{3.2.63}$$

If we substitute (3.2.34) into (3.2.57)

$$\Lambda = \frac{r v' - 1 + \Lambda^2}{r(v'a + a')} \tag{3.2.64}$$

Using (3.2.16) in (3.2.13) we obtain the equations

$$g r (v'a + a') W + g r \Lambda W' \mp \frac{1}{2} \partial_r \left[r e^{-w} (v'a + a') \right] \sqrt{1 - \Lambda^2} = 0 \tag{3.2.65}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\mp g r (v'a + a') W \sqrt{1 - \Lambda^2} + \Lambda \partial_r (e^{-w}) - \Lambda g^2 r e^w W^2 \\ &+ \frac{1}{2} \partial_r \left[r e^{-w} (v'a + a') \right] = 0 \end{aligned} \tag{3.2.66}$$

Similarly from (3.2.11) we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\Lambda g \tilde{D}_r \left(\sqrt{\frac{3}{2}} e^v a^I P^s_I \right) + \frac{g}{2} e^v W' Q^s \mp \sqrt{1 - \Lambda^2} Q^s \left[\frac{1}{2} g^2 e^{v+w} W^2 + \frac{1}{2} e^{v-w} \left(v'a + a' \right)^2 \right. \\ &\left. - \frac{1}{2} \partial_r (v' e^{v-w}) \right] = 0 \end{aligned} \tag{3.2.67}$$

$$\begin{aligned}&\mp\sqrt{1-\Lambda^2}ge^vW'+\Lambda e^v\partial_r\left[e^{-w}\left(v'a+a'\right)\right]+g^2e^{v+w}W^2+e^{v-w}\left(v'a+a'\right)^2\\&-\partial_r(v'e^{v-w})=0\end{aligned} \tag{3.2.68}$$

We observe that all the relations already derived reduce to those in [28] if we take $\Lambda = a$. So it is easy to conclude that $l^x \equiv 0$ is compatible with BPS conditions and reduces to the set of equations (2.5.1)-(2.5.4) plus the one for the scalars of the vector multiplets.

3.3 Static BPS configurations

In this section we derive the independent set of equations that characterizes BPS configurations.

We start by considering integrability conditions (3.2.65) and (3.2.66): subtracting from (3.2.65) the equation (3.2.66) multiplied by $\mp\sqrt{1-\Lambda}$ we get

$$gr\Lambda(v'a+a')W+grW'\mp\sqrt{1-\Lambda^2}w'e^{-w}\mp g^2r\sqrt{1-\Lambda^2}e^wW^2=0 \tag{3.3.1}$$

Using (3.2.64) and (3.2.34) it gives

$$W'=-(v'+w')W \tag{3.3.2}$$

that implies $gr_0W=\mp e^{-(v+w)}$ where r_0 is a constant. This last expression can be rewritten considering again (3.2.34) as

$$e^v=\mp\frac{r}{r_0\sqrt{1-\Lambda^2}} \tag{3.3.3}$$

which is fundamental to demonstrate the compatibility of BPS conditions. Indeed taking the derivative with respect to r and comparing with (3.2.64) we obtain

$$v'a+a'=v'\Lambda+\Lambda' \tag{3.3.4}$$

This means that the integrability conditions and consequently the BPS equations for the metric (w and v) and for the scalars of the hypermultiplets have the same form as the ones in [28]: hence their consistency is ensured and the only change is the replacement of a by Λ . The new ingredients here, due to the introduction of vector multiplets, are then the equation for ϕ^x and the relations between a and Λ (3.2.62).

Note that here a' is not the derivative of a with respect to r. Indeed we have defined define $a'\equiv h_Ia'^I$. Using (3.2.60) it is easy to find

$$a'=\partial_ra-\sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}l_x\phi'^x \tag{3.3.5}$$

Substituting it in (3.3.4) and using the second eq. of (3.2.62) we get

$$v'a+\partial_ra+\frac{2}{r}(a-\Lambda)=v'\Lambda+\Lambda' \tag{3.3.6}$$

which gives

$$\Lambda = a + \frac{\mu}{r^2} e^{-v} \tag{3.3.7}$$

where μ is an integration constant. Using (3.2.62) the last expression can be rewritten to show in a transparent manner the relation between μ and l^xas

$$\frac{\sqrt{6}\mu}{3r^3} e^{-v} = l_x \phi'^x \tag{3.3.8}$$

The implication of this expression on the existence of fixed points still has to be clarified. Now it is not so difficult to show that the BPS conditions we have derived satisfy the equations of motion. We refer the reader to the appendix B for the technical details.

To summarize how it has been obtained, we conclude this section presenting a set of independent BPS equations

$$1 = \Lambda^2 e^{-2w} \left[1 + \frac{r}{2} \left(v' + \frac{\Lambda'}{\Lambda} \right) \right]^2 \tag{3.3.9}$$

$$e^v = \frac{r}{r_0 \sqrt{1 - \Lambda^2}} \tag{3.3.10}$$

$$\sqrt{1 - \Lambda^2} = \mp g e^w r W \tag{3.3.11}$$

$$q'^Z = \pm 3 g e^w \sqrt{1 - \Lambda^2} \partial^Z W \tag{3.3.12}$$

$$\phi'^x = \pm 3 g e^w \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 - \Lambda^2}} \partial^x W \tag{3.3.13}$$

$$\Lambda = a + \frac{\mu}{r^2} e^{-v} \tag{3.3.14}$$

$$\frac{\sqrt{6}\mu}{3r^3} e^{-v} = l_x \phi'^x \tag{3.3.15}$$

3.4 Discussion

In this section we want to recall the results already obtained and to point out which topics deserve more study. First of all we have derived BPS equations for this case, studying in the line of [28], the relations from the hyperini and the gaugini and integrability conditions for the gravitini. We observe that the former ones have the same structure manifested in the domain wall case [20]: this suggests the possibility of determining some properties of BPS solutions without starting from the specific ansatz. The importance of a similar study is evident: for example this could permit us to give a definitive answer in the quest for a realistic cosmological model in gauged supergravity. These features are currently under investigation [35], and a part of the results, for hypermultiplet couplings only, will be presented in the next chapter.

Furthermore we have derived the system of differential equations that is a generalization of the one in [28]: as we stated it should admit solutions with two fixed points. It remains however to be studied, hopefully leading to construction of an explicit example.

Chapter 4

Bps solutions with hypermultiplets

4.1 Introduction

In this last chapter we discuss the properties of BPS solutions in the presence of matter couplings. We want to trascend the limitations due to the choice of a special configuration to study and, instead, try to investigate why there are some features common to different families of solutions. There we will concentrate on the Maxwell–Einstein supergravity theory with hypermultiplets charged under the $U(1)$ gauge group.

To further this aim we adopt a double strategy. First we consider the integrability conditions and the hyperini equation for a generic space–time metric $g_{\mu\nu}$ and graviphoton A_μ with an arbitrary number of hypermultiplets n_H, without selecting any particular ansatz. We show that it is possible, although with a lot of calculations, to obtain general results in this way: in particular we demonstrate that integrability conditions satisfy the Einstein equations for the metric (imposing only that the Maxwell–Einstein equation holds for the graviphoton) and that the hyperini equation can be reduced to a more manageable form which explains the geometrical meaning of the gauge covariant derivative of the scalars $D_\mu q^X$ in terms of the killing vector K^X and the prepotential P^r.

The second "weapon" we use is given by the geometric method, first introduced by Gauntlett et al in [29], to classify BPS solutions by determining the group structure of the base space (see sect.4.5). The strength of this method is that it is possible to derive the general form of the BPS solutions by assuming only the existence of a killing spinor.[1] Let us start by reminding of the main topic of the theory, reviewed in the chapter 1.

---

[1] This is at the same time also a limitation, because the resulting coordinate system is in most of the cases not "natural".

4.2 The Model

The field content of the $\mathcal{N}$=2 supergravity in five dimensions with hypermultiplet couplings is the following

- the supergravity multiplets

  $$\{e^a_\mu \ , \psi^i_\mu \ , A_\mu\} \tag{4.2.1}$$

  containing the *graviton* e^a_μ, two *gravitini* ψ^i_μ and the *graviphoton* A_μ;

- a hypermultiplet

  $$\{\zeta^A \ , q^X\} \tag{4.2.2}$$

  containing $2n_H$ *hyperini* ζ^A , $\quad A = 1, \dots, 2n_H$ with spin $\frac{1}{2}$ and $4n_H$ *scalars* q^X which define a quaternionic manifold with metric g_{XY}; The bosonic Lagrangian density is [5]

  $$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{BOS} &= -\frac{1}{2}e\{R + \frac{1}{2}F_{\mu\nu}F^{\mu\nu} + g_{XY}D_\mu q^X D^\mu q^Y \\ &+ 2\mathcal{V}(q,\phi)\} + \frac{1}{6\sqrt{6}}\epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma\tau}F_{\mu\nu}F_{\rho\sigma}A_\tau \end{aligned} \tag{4.2.3}$$

  $\mathcal{V}(q,\phi)$ being the potential as given in appendix.

4.3 BPS equations and equations of motion

The supersymmetry transformations of the fermions are:
for the gravitini

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_\epsilon\psi_{\mu i} &= \hat{\mathcal{D}}_\mu\epsilon_i && (4.3.1) \\ &= \partial_\mu\epsilon_i + \frac{1}{4}\omega^{ab}_\mu\gamma_{ab}\epsilon_i - \partial_\mu q^X {p_{Xi}}^j\epsilon_j - gA_\mu {P_i}^j\epsilon_j \\ &+ \frac{i}{4\sqrt{6}}(\gamma_{\mu\nu\rho} - 4g_{\mu\nu}\gamma_\rho)F^{\tilde{I}\nu\rho}\epsilon_i - \frac{i}{\sqrt{6}}g{P_i}^j\gamma_\mu\epsilon_j = 0 && (4.3.2) \end{aligned}$$

for the hyperini

$$\delta_\epsilon\zeta^A = \left[-\frac{i}{2}\gamma^a\partial_a q^X - \frac{i}{2}\gamma^a gA_a K^X + g\frac{\sqrt{6}}{4}K^X\right] f^A_{Xi}\epsilon^i = 0 \tag{4.3.3}$$

4.3.1 Integrability conditions

We now consider the BPS equations for the gravitini; their integrability conditions are given by the commutators $[\hat{\mathcal{D}}_\mu, \hat{\mathcal{D}}_\nu] = 0$ which we decompose in the sum of 15 non trivial pieces[2]:

$$\left[\partial_\mu + \frac{1}{4}\omega_\mu^{ab}\gamma_{ab}, \partial_\nu + \frac{1}{4}\omega_\nu^{cd}\gamma_{cd}\right]\epsilon_i = \frac{1}{4}\Omega_{\mu\nu}{}^{ab}\gamma_{ab}\epsilon_i \tag{4.3.4}$$

$$-\left[\partial_\mu + \frac{1}{4}\omega_\mu^{ab}\gamma_{ab}, \partial_\nu q^X p_{Xi}{}^j\right]\epsilon_j - (\mu \leftrightarrow \nu) = -\left[\partial_\nu q^X \partial_\mu p_{Xi}{}^j - \partial_\mu q^X \partial_\nu p_{Xi}{}^j\right]\epsilon_j \tag{4.3.5}$$

$$\left[\partial_\mu + \frac{1}{4}\omega_\mu^{ab}\gamma_{ab}, -gA_\nu^I P_{Ii}{}^{\ \ j}\right] - (\mu \leftrightarrow \nu) = -g\left(\partial_\mu\left[A_\nu P_i{}^{\ \ j}\right] - \partial_\nu\left[A_\mu P_i{}^{\ \ j}\right]\right)\epsilon_j \tag{4.3.6}$$

$$\begin{aligned}&\left[\partial_\mu + \frac{1}{4}\omega_\mu^{ab}\gamma_{ab}, \frac{i}{4\sqrt{6}}(\gamma_{\nu\tau\rho} - 4g_{\nu\tau}\gamma_\rho)F^{\tau\rho}\right]\epsilon_i - (\mu \leftrightarrow \nu)\\ &= \frac{i}{4\sqrt{6}}\left[(\gamma_\nu\gamma_a - 4e_{\nu a})\gamma_b\mathcal{D}_\mu F^{ab} - (\gamma_\mu\gamma_a - 4e_{\mu a})\gamma_b\mathcal{D}_\nu F^{ab}\right]\epsilon_j\end{aligned} \tag{4.3.7}$$

$$\left[\partial_\mu + \frac{1}{4}\omega_\mu^{ab}\gamma_{ab}, -\frac{i}{\sqrt{6}}gP_i{}^{\ \ j}\gamma_\nu\right]\epsilon_j - (\mu \leftrightarrow \nu) = \frac{ig}{\sqrt{6}}\left(\gamma_\mu\partial_\nu P^{\ j} - \gamma_\nu\partial_\mu P_i{}^j\right)\epsilon_j \tag{4.3.8}$$

$$\left[i\partial_\mu q^X p_X^r(\sigma_r)_i{}^j, i\partial_\nu q^Y p_Y^s(\sigma_s)_i{}^j\right]\epsilon_j = -i2\partial_\mu q^X\partial_\nu q^Y p_X^r p_Y^s \epsilon_{rs}{}^t(\sigma_t)_i{}^j\epsilon_j \tag{4.3.9}$$

$$\left[i\partial_\mu q^X p_X^r(\sigma_r)_i{}^j, igA_\nu P^s(\sigma_s)_i{}^j\right]\epsilon_j - (\mu \leftrightarrow \nu) = -4ig\partial_{[\mu}q^X p_X^r A_{\nu]}P^s\epsilon_{rs}{}^t(\sigma_t)_i{}^j\epsilon_j \tag{4.3.10}$$

$$\left[i\partial_\mu q^X p_X^r(\sigma_r)_i{}^j, \frac{i}{4\sqrt{6}}(\gamma_{\mu\nu\rho} - 4g_{\mu\nu}\gamma_\rho)F^{\nu\rho}\right]\epsilon_j - (\mu \leftrightarrow \nu) = 0 \tag{4.3.11}$$

$$\begin{aligned}&-\left[i\partial_\mu q^X p_X^r(\sigma_r)_i{}^j, \frac{g}{\sqrt{6}}P^s\gamma_\nu(\sigma_s)_i{}^j\right]\epsilon_j - (\mu \leftrightarrow \nu)\\ &= \frac{4}{\sqrt{6}}g\partial_{[\mu}q^X p_X^r P^s e^a_{\nu]}\gamma_a\epsilon_{rs}{}^t(\sigma_t)_i{}^j\epsilon_j\end{aligned} \tag{4.3.12}$$

$$\left[igA_\mu P^r(\sigma_r)_i{}^j, igA_\nu P^s(\sigma_s)_i{}^j\right]\epsilon_j = -2ig^2A_\mu A_\nu P^r P^s\epsilon_{rs}{}^t(\sigma_t)_i{}^j\epsilon_j = 0 \tag{4.3.13}$$

$$-\left[igA_\mu P^r(\sigma_r)_i{}^j, \frac{i}{4\sqrt{6}}(\gamma_{\mu\nu\rho} - 4g_{\mu\nu}\gamma_\rho)F^{\nu\rho}\right]\epsilon_j - (\mu \leftrightarrow \nu) = 0 \tag{4.3.14}$$

$$-\left[igA_\mu P^r(\sigma_r)_i{}^j, \frac{g}{\sqrt{6}}P^s\gamma_\nu(\sigma_s)_i{}^j\right]\epsilon_j - (\mu \leftrightarrow \nu) = \frac{4}{\sqrt{6}}g^2A_{[\mu}P^r P^s\gamma_{\nu]}\epsilon_{rs}{}^t(\sigma_t)_i{}^j\epsilon_j = 0 \tag{4.3.15}$$

$$\begin{aligned}&-\frac{1}{96}\left[(\gamma_{\mu ab} - 4g_{\mu a}\gamma_b)F^{ab}, (\gamma_{\nu cd} - 4g_{\nu c}\gamma_d)F^{cd}\right]\epsilon_i\\ &= \left\{\frac{1}{24}F^2\gamma_{\mu\nu} + \frac{1}{12}\left[F^2_\nu{}^d\gamma_{d\mu} - F^2_\mu{}^d\gamma_{d\nu}\right] - \frac{1}{4}F_\mu{}^{\ a}F_\nu{}^{\ b}\gamma_{ab} - \frac{1}{6}F_{[\mu}{}^bF^{cd}\gamma_{\nu]bcd}\right\}\epsilon_i\end{aligned} \tag{4.3.16}$$

---

[2] This relations, that here are specialized to the abelian case, can be easily extended also to the non-abelian case.

$$\frac{1}{24}\left[(\gamma_{\mu ab} - 4g_{\mu a}\gamma_b)F^{ab}, gP_i{}^j\gamma_{\nu]}\right]\epsilon_j - (\mu \leftrightarrow \nu) \\ = \frac{1}{6}g\gamma_{\mu\nu ab}F^{ab}P_i{}^j\epsilon_j + gP_i{}^j\frac{2}{3}F_{[\mu}{}^b\gamma_{\nu]b}\epsilon_j \tag{4.3.17}$$

$$\left[\frac{i}{\sqrt{6}}gP_i{}^j\gamma_\mu, \frac{i}{\sqrt{6}}gP_i{}^j\gamma_\nu\right]\epsilon_j = \frac{g^2}{3}\gamma_{\mu\nu}|P|^2\epsilon_i \tag{4.3.18}$$

Difficulties in derivations of the above commutators arise only in Eq.(4.3.7) and Eq.(4.3.16) and are explicitly shown in appendix C. There it is also shown how the terms can be collected to give the following result

$$\Big\{\frac{1}{4}\Omega_{\mu\nu}{}^{ab}\gamma_{ab}\delta_i{}^j - iR^r_{\mu\nu}(\sigma_r)_i{}^j - igP^rF_{\mu\nu}(\sigma_r)_i{}^j \\ +\frac{i}{4\sqrt{6}}\left[\gamma_{\nu ab}\mathcal{D}_\mu F^{ab} - \gamma_{\mu ab}\mathcal{D}_\nu F^{ab}\right]\delta_i{}^j + \frac{i}{\sqrt{6}}\left[e_{\mu a}\gamma_b\mathcal{D}_\nu F^{ab} - e_{\nu a}\gamma_b\mathcal{D}_\mu F^{ab}\right]\delta_i{}^j \\ -\frac{g}{\sqrt{6}}(\gamma_\mu D_\nu P^r - \gamma_\nu D_\mu P^r)(\sigma_r)_i{}^j + \frac{1}{24}F^2\gamma_{\mu\nu}\delta_i{}^j + \frac{1}{12}\left[F^2_\nu{}^d\gamma_{d\mu} - F^2_\mu{}^d\gamma_{d\nu}\right]\delta_i{}^j \\ -\frac{1}{4}F_\mu{}^aF_\nu{}^b\gamma_{ab}\delta_i{}^j - \frac{1}{6}F_{[\mu}{}^bF^{cd}\gamma_{\nu]bcd}\delta_i{}^j + \frac{1}{6}g\gamma_{\mu\nu ab}F^{ab}P_i{}^j + \frac{2}{3}gF_{[\mu}{}^b\gamma_{\nu]b}P_i{}^j \\ +\frac{g^2}{3}\gamma_{\mu\nu}|P|^2\delta_i{}^j\Big\}\epsilon_j = 0 \tag{4.3.19}$$

where we have defined

$$F^{2ab} := \eta_{cd}F^{ca}F^{db} \ , \tag{4.3.20}$$

$$F^2 := F_{ab}F^{ab} \ , \tag{4.3.21}$$

$$|P|^2 = \delta_{rs}P^rP^s \ , \tag{4.3.22}$$

$$B_{*i}{}^j := iB_*{}^r(\sigma_r)_i{}^j \ , \tag{4.3.23}$$

$$R^r_{\mu\nu} := D_\mu q^X D_\nu q^Y R^r_{XY} \ , \tag{4.3.24}$$

$$R^r_{\mu\nu} := D_\mu q^X D_\nu q^Y R^r_{XY} \ , \tag{4.3.25}$$

$$D_\nu P^r := D_\nu q^X D_X P^r \tag{4.3.26}$$

4.3.2 Some manipulations

Let us try to get some information out of (4.3.19) by means of contractions. If one multiplies (4.3.19) by γ^α and then contracts α with ν, using the first Bianchi identity for Ω one obtains

$$\Big\{-\delta_i{}^j\frac{1}{2}\mathcal{R}_{\mu b}\gamma^b - iR^r_{\mu a}\gamma^a(\sigma_r)i\ ^j - \frac{i}{2\sqrt{6}}\delta_i{}^j\gamma_{ab}\mathcal{D}_\mu F^{ab} \\ + \left[\frac{i}{\sqrt{6}}\gamma^{cb}\mathcal{D}_cF_{\mu b} - \frac{i}{\sqrt{6}}\mathcal{D}_aF^a_\mu + \frac{i}{2\sqrt{6}}\mathcal{D}_aF^{ab}\gamma_{\mu b} - \frac{1}{4\sqrt{6}}e_{d\mu}\epsilon^{dc}{}_{abe}\gamma^e\mathcal{D}_cF^{ab}\right]\delta_i{}^j \\ + \left(\frac{4g}{\sqrt{6}}D_\mu P^r + \frac{g}{\sqrt{6}}\gamma_\mu{}^aD_aP^r\right)(\sigma_r)_i{}^j + \Big[-\frac{1}{12}F^2\gamma_\mu + \frac{1}{2}F^{2b}_\mu\gamma_b + \frac{1}{6}F_\mu{}^bF^{cd}\gamma_{bcd} \\ -\frac{i}{12}e^f_\mu F^{ab}F^{cd}\epsilon_{abcdf}\Big]\delta_i{}^j - \frac{4}{3}g^2\gamma_\mu|P|^2\delta_i{}^j\Big\}\epsilon_j = 0 \tag{4.3.27}$$

Here $\mathcal{R}_{\mu\nu} = \Omega^a{}_{\mu a\nu}$ is the Ricci tensor and R the Ricci Scalar.

4.3.3 Equations of motion

The Einstein equations are

$$\mathcal{R}_{\mu\nu} + F_{\mu a}F_{\nu}{}^{a} + g_{XY}D_{\mu}q^{X}D_{\nu}q^{Y} - \frac{1}{6}|F|^{2}g_{\mu\nu} + \frac{2}{3}\mathcal{V}g_{\mu\nu} = 0 \tag{4.3.28}$$

from which it follows in particular

$$\frac{3}{2}R + \frac{1}{4}|F|^{2} + \frac{3}{2}|q'|^{2} - 5\mathcal{V} = 0 \tag{4.3.29}$$

Variation with respect to the gauge fields gives

$$\mathcal{D}_{a}F^{af} + \frac{1}{2\sqrt{6}}\epsilon^{abcdf}F_{ab}F_{cd} - gK_{Y}D^{t}q^{Y} = 0 \tag{4.3.30}$$

Finally the equations for the scalars are

$$\hat{D}_{\mu}D^{\mu}q^{W} + gA^{\mu I}D_{\mu}K_{I}^{W} = g^{WX}\partial_{X}\mathcal{V} \tag{4.3.31}$$

Here $\tilde{D}$ indicates a totally covariant derivative, i.e with respect to all the indices. So for example

$$\hat{D}_{\mu}\mathcal{D}^{\mu}q^{X} = D_{\mu}D^{\mu}q^{X} + \Gamma^{X}_{YZ}D_{\mu}q^{Y}D^{\mu}q^{Z}$$

and in general

$$D_{\mu}f^{*}(q) = D_{\mu}q^{X}\partial_{X}f^{*} \ . \tag{4.3.32}$$

4.3.4 Compatibility

In this section we analyze the compatibility between the equations of motion and the BPS equations. In particular we will assume that the BPS equations together with the equations of motions and the Bianchi Identities for the gauge fields are satisfied.

Gravitini

To simplify the analysis of (4.3.27), let us organize it in different steps:

1. the term $a = -iR^{r}_{\mu a}\gamma^{a}(\sigma_{r})_{i}{}^{j}$
   by mean of (4.4.1) one readily finds

$$\begin{aligned} -iR^{r}_{\mu a}\gamma^{a}(\sigma_{r})_{i}{}^{j}\epsilon_{j} = \quad & \Bigg\{\frac{1}{2}\gamma^{a}D_{a}q^{X}g_{XZ}D_{\mu}q^{Z}\delta_{i}{}^{j} + \frac{i}{2}g\sqrt{\frac{3}{2}}K_{Z}D_{\mu}q^{Z}\delta_{i}{}^{j} \\ & -g\sqrt{\frac{3}{2}}D_{\mu}q^{Z}D_{Z}P^{r}(\sigma_{r})_{i}{}^{j}\Bigg\}\epsilon_{j} \end{aligned} \tag{4.3.33}$$

2. the term $c = -\frac{i}{\sqrt{6}}\mathcal{D}_a F^a_{\ \mu} - \frac{i}{12} e^f_\mu F^{ab} F^{cd} \epsilon_{abcdf}$
   from (4.3.30), which we express in the form $\mathcal{M}^b = 0$, it is equal to[3]

$$c = -\frac{ig}{\sqrt{6}} K_Z D_\mu q^Z \delta_i^{\ j} - \frac{i}{\sqrt{6}} \mathcal{M}_\mu \delta_i^{\ j} \tag{4.3.34}$$

3. for the term $d = \frac{i}{2\sqrt{6}} D_a F^{ab} \gamma_{\mu b}$, first we use (4.3.30) to give

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{i}{2\sqrt{6}}\mathcal{M}^b \gamma_{\mu b}\delta_i^{\ j} - \frac{i}{24}\epsilon^{abcde} F_{ab} F_{cd} \gamma_{\mu e} \delta_i^{\ j} - \frac{i}{2\sqrt{6}} g K_Y D_\mu q^Y \delta_i^{\ j} \\ &+ \frac{i}{2\sqrt{6}} g K_Y D^e q^Y \gamma_\mu \gamma_e \delta_i^{\ j}\end{aligned} \tag{4.3.35}$$

   in the last term we can use (4.4.1) contracted with K^Z to give

$$\begin{aligned}d \ = \ & \frac{i}{2\sqrt{6}}\mathcal{M}^b \gamma_{\mu b}\delta_i^{\ j} - \frac{i}{24}\epsilon^{abcde} F_{ab} F_{cd} \gamma_{\mu e} \delta_i^{\ j} \\ & - \frac{i}{2\sqrt{6}} g D_\mu q^Y K_Y - \frac{g}{\sqrt{6}} \gamma_\mu \gamma^a D_a q^X D_X P^r (\sigma_r)_i^{\ j} + \frac{g^2}{4} K^X K_X \gamma_\mu \delta_i^{\ j}\end{aligned} \tag{4.3.36}$$

4. the term $e = \left(\frac{4g}{\sqrt{6}} D_\mu P^r + \frac{g}{\sqrt{6}} \gamma_\mu^{\ a} D_a P^r\right) (\sigma_r)_i^{\ j}$
   This is

$$e = \frac{4g}{\sqrt{6}} D_\mu q^X D_X P^r (\sigma_r)_i^{\ j} + \frac{g}{\sqrt{6}} \gamma_{\mu a} D^a q^X D_X P^r (\sigma_r)_i^{\ j} \tag{4.3.37}$$

5. the term $f = -\frac{i}{2\sqrt{6}} \delta_i^{\ j} \gamma_{ab} \mathcal{D}_\mu F^{ab} + \frac{i}{\sqrt{6}} \gamma^{cb} \mathcal{D}_c F_{\mu b} \delta_i^{\ j}$ can be rewritten as

$$f = \frac{i}{2\sqrt{6}} \gamma^{bc} [\mathcal{D}_b F_{\mu c} + \mathcal{D}_c F_{b\mu} + \mathcal{D}_\mu F_{cb}] \delta_i^{\ j} =: \frac{i}{2\sqrt{6}} \gamma^{bc} \mathcal{B}_{\mu cb} \delta_i^{\ j} \tag{4.3.38}$$

   $\mathcal{B}_{\mu cb} = 0$ being the Bianchi identity.

6. note that

$$\frac{1}{6} F_\mu^{\ b} F^{cd} \gamma_{bcd} = \frac{i}{24} \epsilon^{abcde} F_{ab} F_{cd} \gamma_{\mu e} \delta_i^{\ j} \tag{4.3.39}$$

   and that

$$\frac{g^2}{4} K^X K_X - \frac{4}{3} g^2 |P|^2 = \frac{1}{3} \mathcal{V} \tag{4.3.40}$$

---

[3] For simplicity we omit ϵ_i but it is obvious that the following relations are true only when applied to the killing spinor.

7. the other terms are

$$-\delta_i{}^j \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{R}_{\mu b} \gamma^b \tag{4.3.41}$$

$$-\frac{1}{4\sqrt{6}} e_{d\mu} \epsilon^{dc}{}_{abe} \gamma^e \mathcal{D}_c F^{ab} \delta_i{}^j \tag{4.3.42}$$

$$-\frac{1}{12} F^2 \gamma_\mu + \frac{1}{2} F^{2b}_\mu \gamma_b \delta_i{}^j \tag{4.3.43}$$

If we now write the Einstein equations (4.3.28) in the form $E_{\mu\nu} = 0$ we then see that all the terms can be collected to give

$$\frac{1}{2} E_{\mu b} \gamma^b \epsilon_i - \frac{i}{\sqrt{6}} \mathcal{M}_\mu \epsilon_i + \frac{i}{2\sqrt{6}} \mathcal{M}^b \gamma_{\mu b} \epsilon_i \frac{i}{2\sqrt{6}} \gamma^{bc} \mathcal{B}_{\mu c b} \epsilon_i = 0 \tag{4.3.44}$$

Let us now impose the equation of motion and the Bianchi identities for the Maxwell field. Then

$$E_{\mu b} \gamma^b \epsilon_i = 0 \tag{4.3.45}$$

In the time-like case[4] this ensures that the Einstein equations are automatically satisfied. In the light-like case, the E_{++} components of the Einstein equations must be imposed to vanish.

The derivation of the equation of motion for the scalars starting from the hyperini equation is still under investigation.

4.4 Hypergeometric restrictions

In this section we analyze the projector content of Eq.(4.3.3) deriving the general form that holds for a generic BPS configuration. Then we discuss some particular subcases of interest. Let us now consider the hyperini BPS equations rewritten in the form

$$\left[-i\gamma^a D_a q^X + g\sqrt{\frac{3}{2}} K^X \right] \left(g_{ZX} \delta_i{}^j + 2R^r_{ZX} (\sigma_r)_i{}^j \right) \epsilon^i = 0 \tag{4.4.1}$$

where $K^X = h^I k_I^X$ and $D_a q^X$ is the gauge covariant derivative in flat index. We want to study it for $K \neq 0$ which means that we are away from the fixed point: this should be equivalent to requiring that (4.4.1) and all the other BPS conditions are not trivial.

Without loss of generality we can decompose $D_a q^X$ as

$$D_a q^X = M_a K^X + \Psi_a^X \tag{4.4.2}$$

---

[4] The meaning of this statement will be clarified in the section 4.5

with $\Psi_a^X K_X = 0$. Now multiplying by[5] $K_{\tilde{Z}} \delta_i{}^j - 2i R^s_{\tilde{Z}X} K^X (\sigma_s)_i{}^j$ and symmetrizing in Z, $\tilde{Z}$ we end up, using (4.4.2) and the properties of the $SU(2)$-curvature, with

$$\left\{ \sqrt{\frac{3}{2}} g C_{Z\tilde{Z}} \delta_i{}^j - i\gamma^a \left[\left(M_a C_{Z\tilde{Z}} + \Psi_a^X B_{XZ\tilde{Z}} \right) \delta_i{}^j + 2i \Psi_a^X U^r_{XZ\tilde{Z}} (\sigma_r)_i{}^j \right] \right\} \epsilon_j = 0 \tag{4.4.3}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} C_{Z\tilde{Z}} &= K_Z K_{\tilde{Z}} + 4K^X K^Y R^r_{ZX} R^s_{\tilde{Z}Y} \delta_{rs} && (4.4.4) \\ B_{XZ\tilde{Z}} &= g_{X(Z} K_{\tilde{Z})} + 4R^r_{(Z|X|} R^s_{\tilde{Z})Y} K^Y \delta_{rs} && (4.4.5) \\ U^r_{XZ\tilde{Z}} &= R^r_{(Z|X|} K_{\tilde{Z}} - g_{X(Z} R^r_{\tilde{Z})Y} K^Y + 2R^s_{(\tilde{Z}|Y|} R^t_{Z)X} K^Y \epsilon_{st}{}^r && (4.4.6) \end{aligned}$$

At this point we observe that the four vectors K^X, $R^{rX}{}_Y K^Y \equiv D^X P^r$, are orthogonal to each other and that they generate a subspace V_K of the quaternionic tangent space $T(\mathcal{M})$. Moreover the existence of the triple complex structure $R^{rX}{}_Y$ allows us to construct a local basis by an iterative process that decomposes $T(\mathcal{M})$ in n_H four dimensional subspaces: in fact if we choose a generic vector u out of V_K and orthogonal to the vectors therein (it is always possible to reduce to this case) also the vectors u^r defined as $u^{rX} \equiv 2R^{rX}{}_Y u^Y$ have the same properties so we can define a new subspace V_u and so on. In this basis the matrices defined in (4.4.6) can be written in a compact way as symmetric tensor products on $T(\mathcal{M})$:

$$\begin{aligned} C &= B(K) = K \otimes K + v^r \otimes v^s \delta_{rs} && (4.4.7) \\ B(u) &= u^X B_X = K \otimes u + u^r \otimes v^s \delta_{rs} && (4.4.8) \\ U^r(u) &= u^X U^r_X = \frac{1}{2} \left[u^r \otimes K - u \otimes v^r + v^s \otimes u^t \epsilon_{st}{}^r \right] && (4.4.9) \end{aligned}$$

where u is a generic vector, u^r is $u^{rX} = 2R^{rX}{}_Y u^Y = (R^r(u))^X$ and $v^r = R^r(K)$. As consequence of the property of compositions of complex structures $R^r_Z{}^X R^{sZY} = \frac{1}{4}(g^{XY} \delta^{rs} + 2\epsilon^{rs}{}_t R^{tXY})$ some useful relations hold:

$$B(v^r) = 0 \tag{4.4.10}$$

$$U^r(u^s) = -\frac{1}{2} B(u) \delta^{rs} + u^{[r} \otimes v^{s]} + \frac{1}{2} \epsilon^{rs}{}_t \left(v^t \otimes u - K \otimes u^t \right) \tag{4.4.11}$$

from which follows

$$U^r(v^s) = -\frac{1}{2} C \delta^{rs} \tag{4.4.12}$$

As a consequence it is easy to see that for the consistency of projectors, Ψ_a^X must be of the form

$$\Psi_a^X = v_{ar} v^r \tag{4.4.13}$$

---

[5] This vector is always different from zero if $K = 0$.

or in other words $D_a q^X \in V_K$. Equations (4.4.3) and (4.4.13) can be translated into

$$\Psi_a^Y - \frac{6}{|K|^2} \Psi_a^Y D_Z(WQ^s) D_Y(WQ_s) = 0 \tag{4.4.14}$$

$$\left[\sqrt{\frac{3}{2}} ig \delta_i^{\ j} + \gamma^a M_a \delta_i^{\ j} - 2i \Psi_a^X \frac{D_X P^r}{|K|^2} \gamma^a (\sigma_r)_i^{\ j} \right] \epsilon_j = 0 \tag{4.4.15}$$

where we write explicitly v^{rX} as $2D^X P^r$.

Now it remains to be demonstrated that the relations above are not only a necessary consequence of (4.4.1) but also a sufficient condition for it.

This fact can be easily checked by direct substitution of (4.4.15) in (4.4.1) using the properties of the complex structure and gamma matrix algebra.

We then have the following

Proposition 4.4.1 *Generically the BPS hyperini equations are equivalent to the system*

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_a q^X + g A_a^I K_I^X &= M_a K^X + 2 v_{ar} D^X P^r \\ \sqrt{\frac{3}{2}} ig \epsilon_i + \gamma^a M_a \epsilon_i + i v_a^r \gamma^a \epsilon^j (\sigma_r)_{ji} &= 0 \end{aligned} \tag{4.4.16}$$

These expressions contain all the constraints imposed on the scalars of hypermultiplets due to the quaternionic geometry.

They explain the structure of the equations found for example in [28, 20]. Surely further restrictions arise out from the BPS equation for the gravitini but they will depend on the specific configuration of the Einstein-Maxwell fields. We want to emphasize that this result holds also for a non abelian gauge group with a generic number of vector multiplets.

4.5 Geometric classification: results

In this section we present the results obtained in the presence of only hypermultiplets, following the analysis in [33]. We discuss the new features arising with respect to the minimal gauged case studied there.

We start by assuming the existence of a Killing spinor and constructing the bosonic quantities from it:[6]

$$\begin{aligned} if\varepsilon^{ij} &= \bar{\epsilon}^i\epsilon^j \\ -V_a\varepsilon^{ij} &= \bar{\epsilon}^i\gamma_a\epsilon^j \\ \chi^r_{ab}(\sigma_r)^{ij} &= \bar{\epsilon}^i\gamma_{ab}\epsilon^j \end{aligned} \tag{4.5.1}$$

These are not independent and a lot of relations can be derived from the Fierz identities. In particular

$$\begin{aligned} & i_V\chi^r = 0 \\ & V^aV_a = -f^2 \\ & i_V(*\chi^r) = f\chi^r \\ & V^a\gamma_a\epsilon_i = f\epsilon_i \end{aligned} \tag{4.5.2}$$

Using (4.3.2) we get:

$$df = \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}i_VF \tag{4.5.3}$$

$$\mathcal{D}V = dV = -\sqrt{\frac{2}{3}} * (F\wedge V) + 2\sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}fF + 2\sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}gP_r\chi^r \tag{4.5.4}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}_a\chi^r_{bc} = \partial_a\chi^r_{bc} = {} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}}\left[2F_a^d\,(*\chi^r)_{dbc} + \eta_{a[b}\,(*\chi^r)_{c]de}\,F^{de} - 2F^d_{[b}\,(*\chi^r)_{c]ad} + 4g\eta_{a[b}V_{c]}P^r\right] \\ & - 2\varepsilon^r{}_{st}\left[(\partial_aq^Xp^s_X + gA_aP^s)\chi^t_{bc} + \frac{g}{\sqrt{6}}P^s\,(*\chi^r)_{abc}\right] \end{aligned} \tag{4.5.5}$$

this imply

$$\mathcal{L}_VF = 0 \tag{4.5.6}$$

$$d\chi^r = -2\varepsilon^r{}_{st}\left[\mathcal{A}^s\wedge\chi^t + \sqrt{\frac{3}{2}}gP^s\left(*\chi^t\right)\right] \tag{4.5.7}$$

where $\mathcal{A}^s$ is

$$\mathcal{A}^s = dq^Xp^s_X + gAP^s \tag{4.5.8}$$

---

[6] We choose different conventions than in [33]; the dictionary between our and their (primed) quantities is:

$$\begin{aligned} \eta'_{ab} &= -\eta_{ab} \qquad & \gamma'_a &= -i\gamma_a \\ F' &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}F \qquad & \chi\delta^{r1} &= 2\sqrt{2}gP^r \end{aligned}$$

where they choose the following representation for the Pauli matrices

$$\sigma_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & i \\ -i & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \qquad \sigma_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \qquad \sigma_3 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Because we take $f' = f$, $V'_a = V_a$ and $\phi'^{ij}_{ab} = \phi^{ij}_{ab} = i\chi^r_{ab}(\sigma_r)_i{}^j$ their definitions (4.5.1) in term of the spinor change with respect to those in [33].

As a consequence of (4.5.5) and of the hyperini equations (4.4.16) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\mathfrak{L}_V \chi^r &= (i_V \circ d)\chi^r = \\ & -2g(\sqrt{\frac{3}{2}}f + i_V A)\varepsilon^r{}_{st}(P^s - K^s)\chi^t \end{aligned} \tag{4.5.9}$$

It is possible, like in [33], to use the gauge freedom to have $\mathfrak{L}_V \chi^r = 0$ choosing $i_V A = -\sqrt{\frac{3}{2}}f$.

It would be very interesting to study the consequences of gauge invariance of the BPS equations on general grounds and in particular to determine the space time dependence of the embedding of the gauge group U(1) in the R-symmetry group SU(2). Here we present a preliminary analysis in the case of an infinitesimal transformation:

$$q^X \longmapsto q^X + g\Lambda K^X \tag{4.5.10}$$

$$A_\mu \longmapsto A_\mu - \partial_\mu \Lambda \tag{4.5.11}$$

$$\epsilon_i \longmapsto R_i{}^j \epsilon_j \qquad R = e^{\frac{i}{2}\alpha^r \sigma_r} \simeq \mathbb{1} + \frac{i}{2}\alpha^r \sigma_r \tag{4.5.12}$$

and as a consequence

$$p^r \longmapsto p^r + g\Lambda \mathfrak{L}_K p^r = p^r + g\Lambda\left(-DP^r + DK^r\right); \qquad K^r \equiv K^X p^r_X \tag{4.5.13}$$

$$P^r \longmapsto P^r + g\Lambda \mathfrak{L}_K P^r = P^r + 2g\Lambda \epsilon^r{}_{st} P^s K^t \tag{4.5.14}$$

Using the above relations in (4.3.2) we obtain an equation for the compensator α^r (see sect. 1.4.1)

$$\left\{ D_a\left[\alpha^r - 2g\Lambda(K^r - P^r)\right] + 2g\left(A_a + \frac{i}{\sqrt{6}}\gamma_a\right)\varepsilon^r{}_{st}P^s\left(\alpha^t - 2g\Lambda(K^t - P^t)\right)\right\}\epsilon_i = 0 \tag{4.5.15}$$

The main information we obtain from the equation above is that V is a Killing vector and it generates a symmetry of all the solution (including scalars, if we choose $i_V A = -\sqrt{\frac{3}{2}}f$). To use it we have now to distinguish two cases: that V is time-like or that it is light-like, meaning $f = 0$.

4.5.1 The time-like case

As in [33] we take $V = -\partial_t$ and we write the spacetime metric as

$$ds^2 = -f^2(dt + w)^2 + f^{-1}h_{mn}dx^m dx^n \tag{4.5.16}$$

We take $f > 0$[7] , w and h not depending on t, $e^0 = f(dt + w)$ and $fdw = G^+ + G^-$. Specializing the Fierz identities to this case we find that w is anti-self-dual as a 4d 2-form on the base space B. An important relation is

$$\chi^r_m{}^p \chi^{sn}_p = -\delta^{rs}\delta_m{}^n + \epsilon^{rs}{}_t \chi^t_m{}^n \tag{4.5.17}$$

---

[7] From the Fierz identities this corresponds to taking $\gamma_0\epsilon = \epsilon$.

where m, n, p are curl indices of B. From (4.5.3) and (4.5.4) we derive F

$$F = H - 2gf^{-1}P_r\chi^r \tag{4.5.18}$$

where $H = \sqrt{\tfrac{3}{2}}de^0 - \sqrt{\tfrac{2}{3}}G^+$. Following the calculations of [33] we express $\mathcal{D}_a\chi^r_{bc}$ in terms of H (in this way we isolate the part contributing to the pull-back on B)

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{D}_a\chi^r_{bc} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}}&\left[2H^d_a\,(*\chi^r)_{dbc} + \eta_{a[b}\,(*\chi^r)_{c]de}\,H^{de} - 2H^d_{[b}\,(*\chi^r)_{c]ad}\right] \\ &- 2\varepsilon^r{}_{st}\left[(\partial_a q^X p^s_X + gA_aP^s) - \sqrt{\frac{3}{2}}gf^{-1}P^sV_a\right]\chi^t_{bc}\end{aligned} \tag{4.5.19}$$

where we use $*\chi^r = -f^{-1}V \wedge \chi^r$. Writing (4.5.19) with respect to the metric h of B we end up with

$$\nabla_m\chi^r_{pq} = -2\varepsilon^r{}_{st}\mathcal{A}^s_m\chi^t_{pq} \tag{4.5.20}$$

$$\mathcal{A}^s_m = \partial_m q^X p^s_X + g\left(A_m - \sqrt{\frac{3}{2}}e^0_m\right)P^s \;=\; \partial_m q^X p^s_X + g\left(A_m - \sqrt{\frac{3}{2}}fw_m\right)P^s \tag{4.5.21}$$

where ∇_m is the Levi–Civita connection on B with respect to h. Eq. (4.5.20) needs some comments: it appears to be the direct generalization of the minimal gauged case,[8] where a preferred (constant) direction exists, with the inclusion of a term coming from the scalars of the hypermultiplets. It is natural to suppose that the convenient quantity to perform a geometric classification of the solution is not directly χ^r but its combination with a two form depending on the matter that links together the two quaternionic manifolds. This point deserves more study.

To obtain some further insight, note that to invert (4.5.20) and solve for $\mathcal{A}^s_m$ we need to know the value of $\mathcal{A}^r_m\chi^s_{pq}\delta_{rs}$. In order to evaluate this term we study systematically the relation between D_mq^X and f, V and χ^r imposed by the hyperini equations. All the information can be extracted by contracting (4.4.16) with $\bar{\epsilon}^k$ and $\bar{\epsilon}^k\gamma_b$. This gives

$$i_Vv^r = 0 \tag{4.5.22}$$

$$M_a = \frac{1}{f}\left[\sqrt{\frac{3}{2}}gV_a + v^b_r\chi^r_{ba}\right] \tag{4.5.23}$$

$$D_mq^X = v^n_r\left[\chi^r_{nm}K^X + 2h_{nm}D^XP^r\right] + \sqrt{\frac{3}{2}}gfw_mK^X \tag{4.5.24}$$

from which it follows that $\partial_0q^X = D_0q^X - gA_0K^X = 0$[9]. We note that the equations above, together with (4.5.17), satisfy (4.4.16) identically, hence they are the only requisites for the compatibility of hyperini equation with the gravitini one.

---

[8] This can be easily obtained in our framework as the sub–case n_H choosing a constant prepotential P^r in the σ_1 direction with W proportional to the cosmological constant.

[9] This is a consequence of the gauge choice and at the same time elucidates its meaning.

We can rewrite $\mathcal{A}^s_m$ as

$$\mathcal{A}^s_m = v^n_r \left[\chi^r_{nm} K^X + 2h_{nm} D^X P^r\right] p^s_X + g\left(A_m - \sqrt{\frac{3}{2}} f w_m\right)(P^s - K^s) \quad (4.5.25)$$

Now we return to the discussion of gauge invariance: contracting (4.5.15) by $\bar{\epsilon}^j$ we find

$$D_a\left[\alpha^r - 2g\Lambda(K^r - P^r)\right] + 2g\left(A_a - \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}f}V_a\right)\varepsilon^r{}_{st}P^s\left(\alpha^t - 2g\Lambda(K^t - P^t)\right) = 0 \quad (4.5.26)$$

It is interesting to study this expression in the gauge $i_V A = -\sqrt{\frac{3}{2}}f$ and consider the residual gauge transformations i.e. with $\partial_0\Lambda = 0$, which in the following we indicate as a four dimensional gauge transformation. In this case, using that $\partial_0 q^X = 0$ the above relation implies[10]

$$\alpha^r = 2g\Lambda(K^r - P^r) + \beta P^r \quad (4.5.27)$$

where β is determined by the condition

$$D_{\bar{a}}(\beta P^r) = \partial_{\bar{a}}\beta\ P^r + \beta\partial_{\bar{a}}q^X D_X P^r = 0 \qquad \bar{a} = 1, ..., 4 \quad (4.5.28)$$

This condition has a nice interpretation: it is equivalent to requiring either that $\beta = 0$ or

$$v^r_{\bar{a}} = -\frac{2}{K^2}(\partial_{\bar{a}}\log\beta)\ P^r \quad (4.5.29)$$

The second possibility occurs for example in the electro-static spherically symmetric configurations studied in [28] and in the flat domain walls [20]: as a consequence in these cases the BPS equation for the scalar (4.4.16) results $\partial q^X \propto \partial^X W$ where W is the prepotential. In general we obtain

$$\partial_{\bar{a}}q^X = \left(\frac{\sqrt{6}}{K^2}f^{-1}W\chi^{r\bar{b}}_{\bar{a}}\partial_{\bar{b}}\log\beta\ Q_r - gA_{\bar{a}}\right)K^X - 2\frac{\sqrt{6}}{K^2}\partial_{\bar{a}}\log\beta\ W\partial^X W \quad (4.5.30)$$

4.6 Discussion

Now we want to point out which are the main goals and which questions remain open in this first approach to the classification of BPS solutions with matter couplings. First of all, we think it is already an important result to have shown that a general discussion on BPS solutions of gauged supergravity is possible also in presence of non trivially coupled hypermultiplets. Indeed we have proved that, without performing any restrictive choice on the form of the metric and of the other fields, the integrability conditions (4.3.19) of the gravitini are sufficient to satisfy the Einstein equations for the metric.[11] Furthermore we have demonstrated that the hyperini equation (4.3.3) can be analyzed in full generality clarifying its geometrical meaning. This can be used to obtain some informations *a priori* on the form of the BPS equations for the scalars and on the existence of fixed point solutions. By way of this analysis we are also near to demonstrating (but this has not been presented here) the relation between the hyperini equation and the equation of motion for the scalar fields. We want to remark that these results are relevant, not only to investigate the properties of BPS solutions, but also for the usual ansatz-based construction.

---

[10] It is easy to check using (4.5.27) that (4.5.20) is four dimensional gauge covariant.

Another important contribution, although incomplete, is given by the application of the Gauntlett procedure. As we have explained in section 4.5 the method works in presence of matter quite similarly than in the minimal gauged theory [33]. The principal difficulty arises in the expression (4.5.20) which gives the covariant derivative of the 2–form χ^r on the four dimensional base space B. In fact eq. (4.5.20) generalizes quite naturally the corresponding relation of [33] (that can be obtained as a subcase choosing the constant prepotential in the σ_1 direction) in the sense that the phase of triplet 1–form $\mathcal{A}^s_m$, as for the prepotential P^r, is not a constant due to the gauging of the R–symmetry $SU(2)$. The role of (4.5.20) is fundamental because it is necessary to determine the base space B and to demonstrate the consistency of the method. For example in the minimal gauged case it gives immediately that B is a Kähler space where χ^1 is the Kähler form and that the graviphoton A_μ satisfies the Maxwell equation. We do not know the exact meaning of (4.5.20) yet. At first reading it indicates only that the base space is quaternionic. However we suspect that the Kähler structure is not totally destroyed here but only deformed by the presence of hypermultiplets. In particular we believe that the gauge transformations constitute the key to understanding the content of (4.5.20). It could happen that this relation reduces to the one in absence of matter via a gauge fixing. Our idea is that the gauge transformation might "freeze" the tree dimensional vector $\nabla\chi^r$ on a plane determining the existence of a Kähler form. The problem of this conjecture is that its checking requires the knowledge of the finite gauge transformations hence of the compensator α^r as function of Λ (not only at the first order as in (4.5.27)). This is equivalent to determine the exact embedding of the gauge group $U(1)$ in local R–symmetry $SU(2)$ which characterizes the theory when the hypermultiplets are not trivially coupled. As a last comment, another element that suggests we are on the right track is given by the equation (4.5.30) which explains and generalizes the behavior observed and discussed in chap. 2.

---

[11] We imposed as usual [29] that the Maxwell equations are satisfied.

Conclusion

At this point I want to summarize what it has been presented in this thesis. I will try to convince the reader that the aim of the work has been, at least partially, achieved.

Rather than writing a detailed list of all the results, which could represent a repetition of what has already been presented at the end of each chapter, I will attempt to organize them in a more general discussion.

We have started with the study of charged configurations in presence of matter. This has been fruitful on the one hand because it allows to construct solutions interesting for themselves (like black holes), on the other hand because of the new insights gained in the general structure of BPS solutions. Hence the need of substantiating these general indications arises quite naturally. In this light what has been treated in the last chapter represents at the same time the arrival point (in which the simple "observations" of the previous chapters become definite properties, e.g see the hyperini equation (4.4.16)) and a starting point for an actual classification of BPS solutions in the presence of matter.

With this aim, the synergy between an approach based on a brute force handling of the BPS conditions and the geometric approach due to Gauntlett appears to be fundamental in order to find out the aforementioned classification. If the former is limited by the evident difficulty to manipulate such tricky expressions, the latter gives rise to results which have still to be interpreted from a physical point of view.

For example, it is not trivial to associate the explicit solution discussed in chapter 2 to solutions obtained by means of Gauntlett's method. It is even not known if this solution is time–like or light–like in Gauntlett's framework.

In order to explain these difficulties, let us consider the time–like case (the light–like one does not present new features). As already noted in [29], the time, as it appears in the metric (4.5.16), is associated with supersymmetry and it does not correspond in general to the "physical" time which is related to the ADM mass (if any). It means that, also when the solution has been determined with respect to the geometry of the base space, there remains however a lot of work to be done. This will require to follow both the above approaches.

As far as the perspectives in next future are concerned, we are going to overcome the technical obstacles (like eq. (4.5.20)) already discussed, and we are confident that this goal can be achieved on the grounds of our conjecture about the role of the residual gauge freedom. Then, supported by our analysis in chapter 3, we hope to extend the results of the classification to the inclusion of the vector multiplet couplings.

A more ambitious task would consist in finding a link with M–theory, in particular with the results of classification which has been started in [31]. However this requires a deeper understanding of the compactification down to five dimensions.

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank my advisor Daniela Zanon for her guidance over the last nearly three years. She gave me plenty of space to learn on my own, pushed me when I needed it, and supported me to the end.

A special note of appreciation goes to Sergio Cacciatori, who has been my principal collaborator during my Ph.D, for his fundamental contribution to the results presented in this work. My gratitude to him is not only due to the great number of things I have learned about physics from our discussions, but to the fact that he is, first of all, a friend. I hope that our collaboration will fruitfully continue in the future.

I would like to thank Antoine Van Proeyen for the interest showed in my research activity and for the useful indications and suggestions I have received from him.

I would also like to thank Bert, Geert and Joris that have been very kind and patient reading my thesis and helping me to clean up all the bugs and typos. I have appreciated a lot how they, as other people, have welcomed me in Leuven.

Non posso non ricordare Francesco per aiuto, in campo scientifico e non, ricevuto in questi anni e per la disponibilità che ha sempre dimostrato. Il suo autorevole parere è stato sempre molto gradito, richiesto e ascoltato da me, Federica e Luca, con i quali non ho solo condiviso tanti pranzi in ufficio ma l'intera avventura del dottorato. A Luca in particolare va il mio grazie più sincero per il vicendevole sostegno su cui ho sempre potuto contare nonché per le interessanti discussioni a tutto campo. Ringrazio e saluto tutti coloro che ho avuto occasione di conoscere a Milano e con i quali conto di rimanere in contatto.

Da ultimo un saluto e un grazie del tutto speciale va alla mia famiglia: ai miei genitori, che hanno sempre dato fiducia alle mie scelte sostendole con ogni sforzo, a mia nonna e mia sorella, che ricordo con tanto affetto, e infine ad Antonella, luce dei miei occhi, che ha avuto il coraggio e la sventatezza di legare la sua vita alla mia, condividendone nel bene e nel male tutte le vicende.

Appendix A

Conventions

In this appendix we present some definitions and properties that we use in our work. With

$$q^X \qquad X = 1, \ldots, 4n_H \tag{A.0.1}$$

we denote the scalars of the hypermultiplets which are the coordinates of a quaternionic manifold. We introduce the $4n_H$beins as

$$f_X^{iA}(q^Y)\ , \qquad i = 1, 2 \in SU(2)\ , A = 1, \ldots, 2n_H \in Sp(2n_H) \tag{A.0.2}$$

The splitting of the flat indices in i and A reflects the factorization of the holonomy group in $USp(2)(\simeq SU(2)) \otimes USp(2n_H)$ which is the main feature of those spaces. The indices as a consequence of the symplectic structure are highered and lowered with the antisymmetric matrices

$$\epsilon_{ij}\ , \qquad \mathbb{C}_{AB} \tag{A.0.3}$$

$$\epsilon_{ij} = \epsilon^{ij}\ , \qquad \epsilon_{12} = 1 \tag{A.0.4}$$

$$\mathbb{C}_{AB}\mathbb{C}^{CB} = \delta_A{}^C\ , \qquad \mathbb{C}^{AB} = (\mathbb{C}_{AB})^*\ . \tag{A.0.5}$$

following the NW-SE convention [20].

The important relation

$$f_{XiC} f_{Yj}{}^C = \frac{1}{2}\epsilon_{ij} g_{XY} + R_{XYij} \tag{A.0.6}$$

can be viewed as a definition for the quaternionic metric g_{XY} and for the $SU(2)$ curvature R_{XYij}.

We use the symbols $p_{Xi}{}^j$ for the $SU(2)$ spin connection whereas ω_μ^{ab} denotes the usual Lorentz spin connection. The covariant derivative which appears in the gravitini supersymmetry variation (1.4.57) acts on the symplectic Maiorana spinors ϵ_i as

$$\mathcal{D}_\mu \epsilon_i \ = \ \partial_\mu \epsilon_i + \frac{1}{4}\omega_\mu^{ab}\gamma_{ab}\epsilon_i - \partial_\mu q^X p_{Xi}{}^j \epsilon_j - g A_\mu^I P_{Ii}{}^j \epsilon_j \tag{A.0.7}$$

where the generalized spin connection receives the following contributions: the first term represents the Lorentz action while the others can be identified with the $SU(2)$ action plus a term due to the $SU(2)$ R-symmetry gauging. A^I_μ are (n_V+1) $1-$forms and P^r_I are the prepotentials while g is the gauge coupling. We adopt the convention to define for the quantities with a I index the corresponding "dressed" ones like $P^r \equiv P^r_I h^I$ or $F^{\mu\nu} \equiv F^{\mu\nu}_I h^I$. We note that in this notation the subcase $n_V = 0$ is recovered in a natural way being $I = 0$ and $h^I = h^0 = 1$.[1]

It is useful to introduce the projection on the Pauli matrices for quantities in the adjoint representation of $SU(2)$, for example

$$R_{XYi}{}^{j} = R^r_{XY}(i\sigma_r)_i{}^j \tag{A.0.8}$$

where $(\sigma_r)_i{}^j$ are the usual Pauli matrices

$$\sigma_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} , \qquad \sigma_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -i \\ i & 0 \end{pmatrix} , \qquad \sigma_3 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix} . \tag{A.0.9}$$

which satisfy

$$(\sigma_r)_i{}^j(\sigma_s)_j{}^k = \delta_{rs}\delta_i{}^k + i\epsilon_{rs}{}^t(\sigma_t)_i{}^k \tag{A.0.10}$$

$$[\sigma_r, \sigma_s] = 2i\epsilon_{rst}\sigma^t \tag{A.0.11}$$

The prepotentials are defined by the relation

$$R^r_{XY}K^Y = D_X P^r \tag{A.0.12}$$

$$D_X P^r := \partial_X P^r + 2\epsilon^{rst} p^s_X P^t \tag{A.0.13}$$

where D_X is the $SU(2)$ covariant derivative. They can be expressed in terms of the Killing vectors

$$P^r = \frac{1}{2n_H} D_X K_Y R^{rXY} \tag{A.0.14}$$

The scalar potential (1.4.63) can be expressed for a generic number of hypermultiplets and vector multiplets as

$$\mathcal{V} = g^2[-P_rP^r + 2P_{xr}P^r_y g^{xy} + 2N_{Ai}N^{Ai}] \tag{A.0.15}$$

with

$$N^{Ai} = \frac{\sqrt{6}}{4} h^I K^X_I f^{Ai}_X = \frac{2}{\sqrt{6}} f^{Ai}_X R^{rYX} D_Y P^r \ , \tag{A.0.16}$$

$$P^r_x \equiv -\sqrt{\frac{3}{2}}\partial_x P^r = h^I_x P^r_I \tag{A.0.17}$$

---

[1] This implies, from the definition of very special geometry (1.2.14), that the normalization of C_{IJK} is given by $C_{000} = 1$.

Defining the superpotential W by $P^r = \sqrt{\frac{3}{2}} W Q^r$ with $Q^r Q_r = 1$ the potential becomes

$$\mathcal{V} = -6g^2 W^2 + \frac{9}{2} g^2 [g^{\Lambda\Sigma} \partial_\Lambda W \partial_\Sigma W + W^2 g^{xy} \partial_x Q^r \partial_y Q_r] \tag{A.0.18}$$

where Λ is the curl index of the entire $n_V + 4n_H$–dimensional scalar manifold. From the above relation it follows that the requirement on $\mathcal{V}$ to be of the form (1.4.72), which ensures the gravitational stability, is

$$\partial_x Q^r = 0$$

as found in the sect. 3.2.3.

The universal hypermultiplet ($n_H = 1$) corresponds to the quaternionic Kähler space $\frac{SU(2,1)}{SU(2) \times U(1)}$. A significant parametrization, from a M-theory point of view, is [20]

$$q^X = \{V, \sigma, \theta, \tau\}$$

with the metric

$$\mathrm{d}s^2 = \frac{\mathrm{d}V^2}{2V^2} + \frac{1}{2V^2} (\mathrm{d}\sigma + 2\theta\, \mathrm{d}\tau - 2\tau\, \mathrm{d}\theta)^2 + \frac{2}{V} \left(\mathrm{d}\tau^2 + \mathrm{d}\theta^2\right) . \tag{A.0.19}$$

Using the general properties of quaternionic geometry it is possible from (A.0.19) to derive explicitly all the quantities presented above, in particular the Killing vectors and the prepotentials of the eight isometries of manifold. For the axionic shift we have:

$$\vec{k}_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \qquad \vec{P}_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ -\frac{1}{4V} \end{pmatrix} \tag{A.0.20}$$

The Fierz identity is given by:

$$\bar{\epsilon}_1 \epsilon_2 \bar{\epsilon}_3 \epsilon_4 = \frac{1}{4} \left(\bar{\epsilon}_1 \epsilon_4 \bar{\epsilon}_3 \epsilon_2 + \bar{\epsilon}_1 \gamma_a \epsilon_4 \bar{\epsilon}_3 \gamma^a \epsilon_2 - \frac{1}{2} \bar{\epsilon}_1 \gamma_{ab} \epsilon_4 \bar{\epsilon}_3 \gamma^{ab} \epsilon_2 \right) \tag{A.0.21}$$

Most of the algebraic identities we recorded in section 4.5 were obtained by using the Fierz identity with $\bar{\epsilon}_1 = \bar{\epsilon}^i$, $\epsilon_2 = \epsilon^l$, $\bar{\epsilon}_3 = \bar{\epsilon}^k$ and then setting in turn $\epsilon_4 = \epsilon^j$, $\gamma_a \epsilon^j$ and $\gamma_{ab} \epsilon^j$. The remaining identites were obtained using $\bar{\epsilon}_1 = \bar{\epsilon}^i$, $\epsilon_2 = \gamma_a \epsilon^l$, $\bar{\epsilon}_3 = \bar{\epsilon}^k$ and $\epsilon_4 = \gamma_b \epsilon^j$.

Appendix B

Equations of motion

The equations of motion of the lagrangian (1.4.64)in the presence of hypermultiplets and vector multiplets are

$$-\mathcal{R}_{\mu\nu} + a_{IJ}F^I_{\mu a}F^{Ja}_\nu + g_{XY}D_\mu q^X D_\nu q^Y + g_{xy}D_\mu\phi^x D_\nu\phi^y - \frac{1}{6}|F|^2 g_{\mu\nu} + \frac{2}{3}\mathcal{V}g_{\mu\nu} = 0 \tag{B.0.1}$$

from which it follows in particular

$$-\frac{3}{2}R + \frac{1}{4}|F|^2 + \frac{3}{2}|q'|^2 + \frac{3}{2}|\phi'|^2 - \frac{9}{4}|a^I K_I|^2 + 5\mathcal{V} = 0 \tag{B.0.2}$$

Variation with respect to the gauge fields gives

$$\mathcal{D}_a(a_{IK}F^{Kae}) + \frac{1}{2\sqrt{6}}C_{IJK}\epsilon^{abcde}F^J_{ab}F^K_{cd} - gK^X_I D^e q^Y g_{XY} = 0 \tag{B.0.3}$$

Finally the equations for the scalars are

$$\hat{D}_\mu D^\mu q^W + gA^{\mu I}D_\mu K^W_I = g^{WX}\partial_X\mathcal{V} \tag{B.0.4}$$

$$\hat{D}_\mu D^\mu \phi^x + gA^{\mu I}D_\mu K^x_I = g^{xy}\partial_y\mathcal{V} + \frac{1}{4}g^{xy}\partial_y a_{IJ}F^I_{\mu\nu}F^{J\mu\nu} \tag{B.0.5}$$

Here $\mathcal{D}$ is the covariant derivative with respect to the spin connection and $\hat{D}$ is a totally covariant derivative, ie with respect to all the indices. So for example

$$\hat{D}_\mu D^\mu \varphi^\Lambda = \mathcal{D}_\mu D^\mu \varphi^\Lambda + \Gamma^\Lambda_{\Sigma\Theta}D_\mu\varphi^\Sigma D^\mu\varphi^\Theta$$

and in general

$$D_\mu f^*(q,\phi) = D_\mu q^X\partial_X f^* + D_\mu\phi^x\partial_x f^* \tag{B.0.6}$$

Now we specialize the above relations to the problem studied in the chapter 3. Due to symmetry of the class of solutions considered only the Einstein equations for the components (tt), (rr) and $(\theta\theta)$ are independent:

$$\begin{aligned}-e^{v-w}\partial_r(v'e^{v-w}) - 3\frac{v'}{r}e^{2(v-w)} + e^{2(v-w)}(v'\Lambda + \Lambda')^2 + 4g^2e^{2v}W^2 \\ - 3g^2e^{2v}(1-3\Lambda^2)[\frac{1}{1-\Lambda^2}g^{xy}\partial_x W\partial_y W + g^{XY}\partial_X W\partial_Y W] = 0\end{aligned} \tag{B.0.7}$$

$$\begin{aligned}&e^{w-v}\partial_r(v'e^{v-w})-\frac{3}{r}w'-(v'\Lambda+\Lambda')^2-4g^2e^{2w}W^2\\&\qquad+3g^2e^{2w}(1+3(1-\Lambda^2))[\frac{1}{1-\Lambda^2}g^{xy}\partial_xW\partial_yW+g^{XY}\partial_XW\partial_YW]=0\end{aligned}\tag{B.0.8}$$

$$\begin{aligned}&re^{-2w}(v'-w')-2(1-e^{-2w})+\frac{1}{2}r^2e^{-2w}(v'\Lambda+\Lambda')^2-4g^2r^2W^2\\&\qquad+3g^2r^2[\frac{1}{1-\Lambda^2}g^{xy}\partial_xW\partial_yW+g^{XY}\partial_XW\partial_YW]=0\end{aligned}\tag{B.0.9}$$

$$\sqrt{\frac{3}{2}}ge^va^IK_{IX}q'^X=0\tag{B.0.10}$$

where we use the BPS relations for ϕ'^x, q'^X and $|K|^2=6g^{XY}\partial_XW\partial_YW$. Following the manipulations of [28] we consider the sum of (B.0.7) and (B.0.8) multiplied by $e^{2(v-w)}$

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{(v'+w')}{r}e^{-2w} &= 3g^2[\frac{1}{1-\Lambda^2}g^{xy}\partial_xW\partial_yW+g^{XY}\partial_XW\partial_YW] &\text{(B.0.11)}\\ &= \pm g\frac{e^{-w}}{\sqrt{1-\Lambda^2}}W' &\text{(B.0.12)}\end{aligned}$$

The above expression is the direct generalization of the one in [28] and is identically satisfied by (3.2.34) and (3.3.2). Now by the substitution of (B.0.12) in (B.0.7), (B.0.8) and (B.0.9) it is easy to check that also these expressions are identically satisfied by the set of BPS equations. Finally (B.0.10) is solved by (3.2.27) and the equation $q'^ZK_Z=0$ which follows for example from (3.2.29) and (3.2.40).

Next consider the equatons for the gauge fields:

$$\begin{aligned}&K^I_Xq'^X=0 &\text{(B.0.13)}\\&\partial_r(a_{IJ}e^{-w}r^3(v'a^J+a'^J))-e^wr^3g^2g_{XY}K^X_IK^Y_Ja^J=0 &\text{(B.0.14)}\end{aligned}$$

It is convenient to project these equations on the base (h_I,h^x_J). The contraction of (B.0.13) with h_I gives $K_Xq'^X=0$ which we already shown to be consequence of BPS equations.

The contraction with h_{Ix} gives $q'^XK^I_Xh_{Ix}=0$ which by means of (3.2.29) is equivalent to $\partial^XWK^I_Xh_{Ix}=0$. But from (3.2.42) and (3.2.49) we have

$$\partial_xK^Z=\frac{\partial_xW}{W}K^Z\tag{B.0.15}$$

so that

$$\partial^XWK^I_Xh_{Ix}=\sqrt{\frac{3}{2}}\partial^XW\partial_xK_X=\sqrt{\frac{3}{2}}\frac{\partial_xW}{W}\partial^XWK_X=0\tag{B.0.16}$$

After an integration by parts and using (3.3.4) the contraction of (B.0.14) with h^I gives

$$\partial_r[r^3 e^{-w}(v'\Lambda+\Lambda')] + \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}r^3 e^{-w}\phi'^x h_{Ix}(v'a^I + a'^I) - e^w r^3 g^2 g_{XY} K^X K^Y_J a^J = 0 \tag{B.0.17}$$

and using (3.2.51)

$$\partial_r[r^3 e^{-w}(v'\Lambda+\Lambda')] \mp \frac{2gr^3\Lambda W'}{\sqrt{1-\Lambda^2}} \pm \frac{2gr^3\Lambda q'^X\partial_X W}{\sqrt{1-\Lambda^2}} - e^w r^3 g^2 g_{XY} K^X K^Y_J a^J = 0 \tag{B.0.18}$$

which after use of (3.2.27) can be easily related to the computations in [28] with Λ in place of a.

The contraction with h^I_y gives

$$\begin{aligned} r^3 e^{-w}(\Lambda' + v'\Lambda)\sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}\phi'^x h^I_y h_{Ix} \mp h^I_y \partial_r h^x_I \frac{\partial_x W\sqrt{6}g\Lambda r^3}{\sqrt{1-\Lambda^2}} & \\ \mp \partial_r\left(\frac{\partial_y W\sqrt{6}g\Lambda r^3}{\sqrt{1-\Lambda^2}}\right) &= -g^2 r^3 e^w \sqrt{\frac{3}{2}}\partial_y K^Z K_Z \end{aligned} \tag{B.0.19}$$

From (3.2.34) and (3.2.50) we find

$$-rW\phi'^x = 3\partial^x W \tag{B.0.20}$$

and from (3.2.33), (3.2.34)

$$g^2 e^{2w} r W = -2(W' - \phi'^x\partial_x W) \tag{B.0.21}$$

Using these last equations together with (B.0.15) and (3.3.2) we have

$$h^I_y\partial_r h^x_I\frac{\partial_x W\Lambda r^2}{W} + \Lambda\partial_r\left(\frac{\partial_y W r^2}{W}\right) = -r^2\Lambda\frac{\partial_y W}{W}\phi'^x\frac{\partial_x W}{W} \tag{B.0.22}$$

By means of (3.2.49) and some integration by parts

$$\begin{aligned} h^I_y\partial_r h^x_I\partial_x W &= \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}h^I_y\partial_r h^x_I\partial_x h^J P^s_J Q_s \\ &= -h^I_y\partial_r(h^x_I h^J_x)\frac{2}{3}P^s_J Q_s - \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}\partial_r\partial_y h^J P^s_J Q_s \\ &= h^I_y\partial_r(h_I h^J)\frac{2}{3}P^s_J Q_s - \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}\partial_r[\partial_y(P^s Q_s)] + \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}q'^X\partial_X[\partial_y(P^s Q_s)] \\ &= \frac{2}{3}g_{yx}\phi'^x W - \partial_r(\partial_y W) + q'^X\partial_X(\partial_y W) \\ &= -2r\Lambda\frac{\partial_x W}{W} - \partial_r(\partial_y W) + q'^X\partial_X(\partial_y W) \end{aligned} \tag{B.0.23}$$

where in the last step we have used (3.2.50) and (3.2.34). This together with (3.2.29) and (3.2.43) shows that (B.0.22) is identically satisfied.

The equations of motion for the hyperini are

$$\begin{aligned}&e^{-(v+w)}r^{-3}\partial_r(r^3e^{v-w}g_{ZY}q'^Y)-\frac{1}{2}q'^X\partial_Xg_{ZY}q'^Ye^{-2w}+\frac{3}{4}g^2\partial_Zg_{XY}a^IK_I^Xa^JK_J^Y\\&+\frac{3}{2}g^2g_{XY}a^Ia^J\partial_ZK_I^XK_J^Y=g^2\partial_Z\left(-6W^2+\frac{3}{4}K^2+\frac{9}{2}g^{xy}\partial_xW\partial_yW\right)\end{aligned}\tag{B.0.24}$$

Using (3.2.27), (3.2.29), (3.2.43) and (3.2.50) it becomes

$$\begin{aligned}\pm e^{-w}9\frac{g}{r}\sqrt{1-\Lambda^2}\partial_ZW &\pm 3(v'-w')ge^{-w}\sqrt{1-\Lambda^2}\partial_ZW\\ &\pm e^{-2w}3g\partial_ZW\partial_r(e^w\sqrt{1-\Lambda^2})=-12g^2W\partial_ZW\end{aligned}\tag{B.0.25}$$

which follows from (3.2.34) and the considerations in [28].

The equations of motion for the gaugini are

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{3}{4}\partial_xa_{IJ}e^{-2w}(a'^I+v'a^I)(a'^J+v'a^J)-\frac{1}{2}\partial_xg_{yz}\phi'^y\phi'^ze^{-2w}+r^{-3}e^{-(v+w)}\partial_r(r^3e^{v-w}\phi'^yg_{xy})\\&-g^2\partial_x\left(-6W^2+\frac{3}{4}K^2+\frac{9}{2}g^{zy}\partial_zW\partial_yW\right)=0\end{aligned}\tag{B.0.26}$$

From (3.2.50), (3.2.29) and (3.2.43) we find

$$\begin{aligned}r^{-3}e^{-(v+w)}\partial_r(r^3e^{v-w}\phi'^yg_{xy})=&\pm9\frac{g}{r}\frac{e^{-w}\partial_xW}{\sqrt{1-\Lambda^2}}\pm3gv'\frac{e^{-w}\partial_xW}{\sqrt{1-\Lambda^2}}\pm3ge^{-w}\partial_xW\partial_r\frac{1}{\sqrt{1-\Lambda^2}}\\&+3g\frac{e^{-w}}{\sqrt{1-\Lambda^2}}\left[\frac{3ge^w\partial_y\partial_xW\partial^yW}{\sqrt{1-\Lambda^2}}+3ge^w\partial_x\partial_XW\partial^XW\sqrt{1-\Lambda^2}\right]\end{aligned}\tag{B.0.27}$$

$$\begin{aligned}-g^2\partial_x\left(-6W^2+\frac{3}{4}K^2+\frac{9}{2}g^{zy}\partial_zW\partial_yW\right)=&12g^2W\partial_xW-9g^2\partial_x\partial_YW\partial^YW\\&-\frac{9}{2}g^2\left(\partial_xg^{yz}\partial_yW\partial_zW+2\partial_x\partial_yW\partial^yW\right)\end{aligned}\tag{B.0.28}$$

$$-\frac{1}{2}\partial_xg_{yz}\phi'^y\phi'^ze^{-2w}=-\frac{9}{2}g^2\frac{\partial_yW\partial^yW}{\sqrt{1-\Lambda^2}}\tag{B.0.29}$$

In a similar way as (B.0.23) one finds

$$\partial_xh_I^y\partial_yW=\frac{2}{3}Wh_{Ix}+h_I\sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}\partial_xW-h_I^y\partial_x\partial_yW\tag{B.0.30}$$

From this and (3.3.4), (3.2.51) and (3.2.64) we find

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{3}{4}\partial_xa_{IJ}e^{-2w}(a'^I+v'a^I)(a'^J+v'a^J)=&\mp\frac{6ge^{-w}\partial_xW}{\sqrt{1-\Lambda^2}}\left[v'-\frac{1-\Lambda^2}{r}\right]+\frac{6\Lambda^2g^2W\partial_xW}{1-\Lambda^2}\\&-\frac{9}{2}g^2\frac{\Lambda^2}{1-\Lambda^2}\left(\partial_x\partial_yW\partial^yW-2\partial_xg_{yz}\partial^yW\partial^zW\right)\end{aligned}\tag{B.0.31}$$

Summing up all the terms

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \left(\pm 9 \frac{g}{r} e^{-w} \mp 3 g e^{-w} v' \pm 3 g e^{-w} \frac{\Lambda \Lambda'}{1-\Lambda^2} \right) \frac{\partial_x W}{\sqrt{1-\Lambda^2}} + 12 g^2 W \partial_x W \\ &+ 6 \Lambda^2 g^2 \frac{W \partial_x W}{1-\Lambda^2} \pm 6 g e^{-w} \partial_x W \sqrt{1-\Lambda^2} \end{aligned} \tag{B.0.32}$$

Using (3.2.34) to eliminate e^{-w} from the first and the last term and next (3.2.64) to eliminate $\Lambda' + \Lambda v'$ we finally see that the gaugini equation also are satisfied.

Appendix C

Some computations

C.1 Derivation of Eq.(4.3.7)

At first we consider the commutator

$$\begin{aligned}\left[\partial_\mu + \frac{1}{4}\omega_\mu^{cd}\gamma_{cd}\ ,\ \frac{i}{4\sqrt{6}}\gamma_{nab}F^{ab}e_\nu^n\right]\epsilon_i &= \frac{i}{4\sqrt{6}}\gamma_{nab}\partial_\mu(F^{ab}e_\nu^n) + \frac{i}{16\sqrt{6}}\omega_\mu^{cd}F^{ab}e_\nu^n[\gamma_{cd},\gamma_{nab}] \\ &= \frac{i}{4\sqrt{6}}\gamma_{nab}\partial_\mu(F^{ab}e_\nu^n) - \frac{i}{4\sqrt{6}}\omega_\mu^{cd}e_{c\nu}F^{ab}\gamma_{dab} + \frac{i}{2\sqrt{6}}\omega_{\mu a}{}^{d}F^{ab}e_\nu^n\gamma_{dnb} \qquad \text{(C.1.1)}\end{aligned}$$

where we have used

$$[\gamma_{cd}\ ,\ \gamma_{nab}] = -2\eta_{cn}\gamma_{dab} + 2\eta_{ca}\gamma_{dnb} - 2\eta_{cb}\gamma_{dna} + 2\eta_{dn}\gamma_{cab} - 2\eta_{da}\gamma_{cnb} + 2\eta_{db}\gamma_{cna} \qquad \text{(C.1.2)}$$

If we note that

$$de^n = -\omega^n{}_a \wedge e^a \ \Rightarrow\ \partial_\mu e_\nu^n - \partial_\nu e_\mu^n = -\omega_\mu{}^n{}_c e_\nu^c + \omega_\nu{}^n{}_c e_\mu^c \qquad \text{(C.1.3)}$$

we finally obtain

$$\left[\partial_\mu + \frac{1}{4}\omega_\mu^{cd}\gamma_{cd}\ ,\ \frac{i}{4\sqrt{6}}\gamma_{nab}F^{ab}e_\nu^n\right]\epsilon_i - (\mu \leftrightarrow \nu) = \frac{i}{4\sqrt{6}}\left[\gamma_{\nu ab}\mathcal{D}_\mu(F^{ab}) - \gamma_{\mu ab}\mathcal{D}_\nu(F^{ab})\right]\epsilon_i \qquad \text{(C.1.4)}$$

Next consider the commutator

$$\left[\partial_\mu + \frac{1}{4}\omega_\mu^{cd}\gamma_{cd}\ ,\ -\frac{i}{\sqrt{6}}e_{\nu a}\gamma_b F^{ab}\right]\epsilon_j = -\frac{i}{\sqrt{6}}\partial_\mu\left[e_{\nu a}\gamma_b F^{ab}\right] - \frac{i}{\sqrt{6}}\gamma_c\omega_\mu{}^c{}_b e_{\nu a}F^{ab} \qquad \text{(C.1.5)}$$

where we have used

$$[\gamma_{cd}\ ,\ \gamma_b] = 2\gamma_c\eta_{db} - 2\gamma_d\eta_{cb} \qquad \text{(C.1.6)}$$

As before the total contribution is then

$$\left[\partial_\mu + \frac{1}{4}\omega_\mu^{cd}\gamma_{cd}\ ,\ -\frac{i}{\sqrt{6}}e_{\nu a}\gamma_b F^{ab}\right]\epsilon_j - (\mu \leftrightarrow \nu) = -\frac{i}{\sqrt{6}}\left[e_{\nu a}\gamma_b\mathcal{D}_\mu(F^{ab}) - e_{\mu a}\gamma_b\mathcal{D}_\nu(F^{ab})\right]\epsilon_i \qquad \text{(C.1.7)}$$

(C.1.4) and (C.1.7) together give (4.3.7).

C.2 Derivation of Eq.(4.3.16)

First consider

$$-\frac{1}{96}F^{ab}F^{cd}e^m_\mu e^n_\nu[\gamma_{abm}\ ,\ \gamma_{cdn}] \tag{C.2.1}$$

In five dimensions one has $\gamma_0\gamma_1\gamma_2\gamma_3\gamma_4 = i^k I$ for some integer k. Squaring we see that it must be $i^k = \pm i$. From these considerations we easily find

$$\gamma_{abc} = \pm\frac{i}{2}\epsilon_{abc}{}^{de}\gamma_{de} \tag{C.2.2}$$

which implies

$$\begin{aligned}[\gamma_{abm}\ ,\ \gamma_{cdn}] &= -\frac{1}{4}\epsilon_{abm}{}^{xy}\epsilon_{cdn}{}^{wz}[\gamma_{xy}\ ,\gamma_{wz}] \\ &= -\frac{1}{2}\epsilon_{abm}{}^{xy}\epsilon_{cdn}{}^{wz}[\gamma_{xz}\eta_{\mu\nu} - \gamma_{xw}\eta_{yz} + \gamma_{yw}\eta_{xz} - \eta_{xw}\gamma_{yz}] \\ &= -2\cdot 4!\eta_{aa'}\eta_{bb'}\eta_{mm'}\gamma_x{}^w\delta^{a'b'm'x}_{c\ d\ n\ w}\end{aligned} \tag{C.2.3}$$

(C.2.1) becomes then equal to

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{1}{2}F^{ab}F^{cd}e_{m\mu}e^n_\nu\delta^{abmx}_{cdnw}\gamma_x{}^w = \\ &\qquad \frac{1}{48}F^{ab}F^{cd}e_{m\mu}e^n_\nu\gamma_x{}^w\Big[\delta^a_c(-\delta^b_d\delta^m_w\delta^x_n + \delta^b_n\delta^m_w\delta^x_d + \delta^b_w\delta^m_d\delta^x_n - \delta^b_w\delta^x_d\delta^m_n) \\ &\qquad - \delta^a_d(-\delta^b_c\delta^m_w\delta^x_n + \delta^b_n\delta^m_w\delta^x_c + \delta^b_w\delta^m_c\delta^x_n - \delta^b_w\delta^x_c\delta^m_n) \\ &\qquad - \delta^a_n(-\delta^b_d\delta^m_w\delta^x_c + \delta^b_c\delta^m_w\delta^x_d + \delta^b_w\delta^m_d\delta^x_c - \delta^b_w\delta^x_d\delta^m_c) \\ &\qquad -\delta^a_w(-\delta^b_d\delta^m_c\delta^x_n + \delta^b_n\delta^m_c\delta^x_d + \delta^b_c\delta^m_d\delta^x_n - \delta^b_c\delta^x_d\delta^m_n + \delta^b_d\delta^m_n\delta^x_c - \delta^b_n\delta^x_c\delta^m_d)\Big] \\ &\qquad = \frac{1}{24}F^2\gamma_{\mu\nu} + \frac{1}{12}[F^{2d}_\nu\gamma_{d\mu} - F^{2d}_\mu\gamma_{d\nu} + F_\mu{}^aF_\nu{}^b\gamma_{ab}]\end{aligned} \tag{C.2.4}$$

For the remaining terms we easily have

$$-\frac{1}{6}e_{\mu a}e_{\nu c}F^{ab}F^{cd}[\gamma_b, \gamma_d] = -\frac{1}{3}F_\mu{}^bF_\nu{}^d\gamma_{bd} \tag{C.2.5}$$

and

$$\frac{1}{24}e_{\mu a}F^{ab}F^{cd}[\gamma_b, \gamma_{\nu cd}] - (\mu\leftrightarrow\nu) = -\frac{1}{6}F_{[\mu}{}^{\ b}F^{cd}\gamma_{\nu]bcd} \tag{C.2.6}$$

(C.2.4), (C.2.5) and (C.2.6) together give (4.3.16).

C.3 Collecting the terms

To obtain rapidly Eq.(28) it is convenient to collect the terms in the following way:

$$(4.3.4)+(4.3.5)+(4.3.9) \Longrightarrow \qquad -\frac{1}{4}\Omega_{\mu\nu}{}^{ab}\gamma_{ab}\delta_i{}^j + \partial_\mu q^Y\partial_\nu q^X R_{Y\,X i}{}^{\ j} \tag{C.3.1}$$

$$(4.3.6)+(4.3.10) \Longrightarrow \qquad -g(\partial_\mu A_\nu - \partial_\nu A_\mu)P_i{}^{\ j} - 2gA_{[\nu}D_{\mu]}P_i{}^{\ j} \tag{C.3.2}$$

$$(4.3.7) \Longrightarrow \quad \frac{i}{4\sqrt{6}}\left[\gamma_{\nu ab}\mathcal{D}_\mu F^{ab} - \gamma_{\mu ab}\mathcal{D}_\nu F^{ab}\right]\delta_i{}^j + \frac{i}{\sqrt{6}}\left[e_{\mu a}\gamma_b\mathcal{D}_\nu F^{ab} - e_{\nu a}\gamma_b\mathcal{D}_\mu F^{ab}\right]\delta_i{}^j \tag{C.3.3}$$

$$(4.3.8)+(4.3.12) \Longrightarrow \quad \frac{ig}{\sqrt{6}}(\gamma_\mu D_\nu P_i{}^j - \gamma_\nu D_\mu P_i{}^j) \tag{C.3.4}$$

$$(4.3.16) \Longrightarrow \quad \frac{1}{24}F^2\gamma_{\mu\nu}\delta_i{}^j + \frac{1}{12}\left[F^2_\nu{}^d\gamma_{d\mu} - F^2_\mu{}^d\gamma_{d\nu}\right]\delta_i{}^j - \frac{1}{4}F_\mu{}^a F_\nu{}^b\gamma_{ab}\delta_i{}^j \tag{C.3.5}$$

$$(4.3.16)+(4.3.17) \Longrightarrow \quad -\frac{1}{6}F_{[\mu}{}^b F^{cd}\gamma_{\nu]bcd}\delta_i{}^j + \frac{1}{6}g\gamma_{\mu\nu ab}F^{ab}P_i{}^j \tag{C.3.6}$$

$$(4.3.17)+(4.3.18) \Longrightarrow \quad \frac{2}{3}gF_{[\mu}{}^b\gamma_{\nu]b}P_i{}^j + \frac{g^2}{3}\gamma_{\mu\nu}|P|^2\delta_i{}^j \tag{C.3.7}$$

where with $\mathcal{D}$ we indicate the covariant derivative with respect to the spin connection. Put into the collected terms this gives Eq.(4.3.19)

Appendix D

Domain walls and the Randall-Sundrum mechanism

D.1 The Domain Wall solution

The conventional lore is that a vacuum of gravity or supergravity is a configuration with maximal symmetry, namely with Lorentz invariance $\mathrm{SO}(1, \mathrm{d}-1)$ in d–dimensions. Adding translation invariance one ends up with either Poincaré or de Sitter or anti de Sitter symmetry which forces the vacuum expectation values of all scalar fields to be constant. The new insight provided by the role of the domain wall solutions suggests that we might also consider vacua where there is Poincaré invariance in one dimension less $\mathrm{ISO}(1, \mathrm{d}-2)$ and where the vacuum value of the scalar fields depends on the last *dth* coordinate. These are precisely the domain wall vacua which are expected to be a distinguished property of gauged supergravities. Yet, as I have already mentioned, these wall geometries are like solitons or kinks that interpolate between conventional vacua that we have discussed in sect.1.4.

We start by the general assumption that the action that describes a $(d-2)$-brane can be consistently truncated to [75],[76, 77]

$$A^{[d]}_{D-Wall} = \int d^d x \sqrt{-g} \left[2\, R[g] + \frac{1}{2}\partial^\mu \phi \partial_\mu \phi - 2\,\Lambda\, e^{-a\,\phi} \right] \tag{D.1.1}$$

This admits a distinguished class of solutions that are called **domain walls** since at each instant of time a brane of this type separates the space manifold into two adjacent non overlapping regions:

$$\begin{aligned} ds^2_{DW} &= H(y)^{2\alpha} \, (dx^\mu \otimes dx^\nu \eta_{\mu\nu}) + H(y)^{2\beta}\, dy^2 && \text{(D.1.2)} \\ e^\phi &= H(y)^{-\frac{2a}{\Delta}} && \text{(D.1.3)} \\ H(y) &= c \pm Q\, y && \text{(D.1.4)} \end{aligned}$$

where y is the single coordinate transverse to the wall, c is an arbitrary integration constant and the other parameters appearing in the above formulae have the following values:

$$\alpha = \frac{2}{\Delta(d-2)} \quad ; \quad \beta = 2\,\frac{d-1}{\Delta(d-2)} \quad ; \quad Q = \sqrt{\Lambda\,\Delta} \tag{D.1.5}$$

in terms of Δ which is:

$$\Delta = a^2 - 2\frac{d-1}{d-2} \tag{D.1.6}$$

The form (D.1.4) of the function H is easy to understand because in one–dimension a harmonic function is just a linear function. Since a^2 is a positive quantity, Δ is bounded from below by the special value Δ_{AdS} that corresponds to the very simple case of pure gravity with a negative cosmological constant (case $a = 0$ in eq.(D.1.1)):

$$\Delta \geq \Delta_{AdS} \equiv -2\frac{d-1}{d-2} \tag{D.1.7}$$

The name given to Δ_{AdS} has an obvious explanation. As it was originally shown by Lü, Pope and Townsend in [78], for $a = 0$ the domain wall solution (D.1.2) describes a region of the anti de Sitter space AdS_d. To verify this statement it suffices to insert the value (D.1.7) into (D.1.5) and (D.1.2) to obtain:

$$ds^2_{DW} = H^{-2/(d-1)}(y)\,(dx^\mu \otimes dx^\nu \eta_{\mu\nu}) + H(y)^{-2}\,dy^2 \tag{D.1.8}$$

Performing the coordinate transformation:

$$r = \frac{1}{Q}\,\ln\left(c \pm Q\,y\right) \tag{D.1.9}$$

the metric becomes:

$$ds^2_{DW} = e^{-2\lambda r}\,\eta_{\mu\nu}\,dx^\mu\,dx^\nu + dr^2 \tag{D.1.10}$$

where

$$\lambda = \sqrt{\tfrac{2\Lambda}{(d-1)(d-2)}} = (d-1)Q \tag{D.1.11}$$

In the same coordinates the solution for the dilaton field is:

$$e^\phi = \exp\left[-\frac{2\,a\,\lambda}{\Delta\,(d-1)}\,r\right] \tag{D.1.12}$$

Eq.(D.1.10) is the metric of AdS spacetime, in horospherical coordinates. Following [78] we can verify this statement by introducing the $(d+1)$ coordinates (X, Y, Z^μ) defined by

$$\begin{aligned} X &= \frac{1}{\lambda}\,\cosh\lambda r + \tfrac{1}{2}\lambda\,\eta_{\mu\nu}\,x^\mu x^\nu\,e^{-\lambda r} \\ Y &= -\frac{1}{\lambda}\,\sinh\lambda r - \tfrac{1}{2}\lambda\,\eta_{\mu\nu}\,x^\mu x^\nu\,e^{-\lambda r} \\ Z^\mu &= x^\mu\,e^{-\lambda r} \end{aligned} \tag{D.1.13}$$

They satisfy

$$\begin{aligned}\eta_{\mu\nu}\, Z^\mu Z^\nu + Y^2 - X^2 &= -1/\lambda^2 && \text{(D.1.14)}\\ \eta_{\mu\nu}\, dZ^\mu dZ^\nu + dY^2 - dX^2 &= e^{-2\lambda r}\eta_{\mu\nu}\, dx^\mu\, dx^\nu + dr^2 && \text{(D.1.15)}\end{aligned}$$

which shows that (D.1.10) is the induced metric on the algebraic locus (D.1.14) which is the standard hyperboloid corresponding to the *AdS* space–time manifold. The signature of embedding flat space is $(-,+,+,\cdots,+,-)$ and therefore the metric (D.1.10) has the right $SO(2,d-1)$ isometry of the AdS$_d$ metric.

Still following the discussion in [78] we note that in horospherical coordinates $X+Y=\lambda^{-1}\,e^{-\lambda r}$ is non-negative if r is real. Hence the region $X+Y<0$ of the full AdS spacetime is not accessible in horospherical coordinates. Indeed this coordinate patch covers one half of the complete AdS space , and the metric describes AdS$_d/\mathbb{Z}_2$ where $\mathbb{Z}_2$ is the antipodal involution $(X,Y,Z^\mu)\rightarrow(-X,-Y,-Z^\mu)$. If d is even, we can extend the metric (D.1.8) to cover the whole anti de Sitter spacetime by setting the integration constant $c=0$ which implies $H=Q\,y$. So doing the region with $y<0$ corresponds to the previously inaccessible region $X+Y<0$. If odd dimensions, we must restrict H in (D.1.8) to be non-negative in order to have a real metric and thus in this case we have to choose $H=c+Q|y|$, with $c\geq 0$. If the constant c is zero, the metric describes AdS$_d/\mathbb{Z}_2$, while if c is positive, the metric describes a smaller portion of the complete AdS spacetime. In any dimension, if we set:

$$H=c+Q|y| \qquad \text{(D.1.16)}$$

the solution can be interpreted as a domain wall at $y=0$ that separates two regions of the anti de Sitter spacetime, with a delta function curvature singularity at $y=0$ if the constant c is positive.

D.2 The Randall Sundrum mechanism

The magic of this solution is that, as shown by Randall and Sundrum in [6], it leads to the challenging phenomenon of **gravity trapping**. These authors have found that because of the exponentially rapid decrease of the factor

$$\exp[-\lambda|r|] \quad \text{with} \quad \lambda>0 \qquad \text{(D.2.1)}$$

away from the thin domain wall that separates the two asymptotic anti de Sitter regions it happens that gravity in a certain sense is localized near the brane wall. Instead of the d–dimensional Newton's law that gives:

$$\text{force}\sim\frac{1}{R^{d-2}} \qquad \text{(D.2.2)}$$

one finds the the $d-1$–dimensional Newton's law

$$\text{force}\sim\frac{1}{R^{d-3}}+\text{small corrections }\mathcal{O}\left(\tfrac{1}{R^{d-2}}\right) \qquad \text{(D.2.3)}$$

This can be seen by linearizing the Einstein equations for the metric fluctuations around any domain wall background of the form:

$$ds^2 = W(r)\,\eta_{\mu\nu}\,dx^\mu\,dx^\nu + dr^2 \tag{D.2.4}$$

that includes in particular the AdS case (D.1.10). In a very sketchy way if one sets:

$$h_{\mu\nu}(x,y) = \exp\left[\mathrm{i}p\cdot x\right]\;\psi_{\mu\nu}(y) \tag{D.2.5}$$

one finds that the linearized Einstein equations translate into an analog Schroedinger equation for the wave–function $\psi(y)$. This problem has a potential that is determined by the warp factor $W(y)$. If in the spectrum of this quantum mechanical problem there is a normalizable zero mode then this is the wave function of a $d-1$ dimensional graviton. This state is indeed a bound state and falls off rapidly when leaving the brane. Since the extra dimension is non compact the Kaluza Klein states form a continuous spectrum without a gap. Yet $d-1$ dimensional physics is extremely well approximated because the bound state mode reproduces conventional gravity in $d-1$ dimensions while the massive states simply contribute a small correction.

It is clearly of utmost interest to establish which domain walls have this magic trapping property besides the anti de Sitter one. This has been done by Cvetic, Lü and Pope in [79]. For obvious phenomenological reasons the case $d = 5$ is the most interesting one and there have been a lot of attempts to construct explicit models in $\mathcal{N} = 2$ gauged supergravity [23],[24],[17],[25],[26]. Let me summarize which are the requirements for the embedding of the Randall–Sundrum scenario inside a supersymmetric five–dimensional field theory

- The candidate theory admits at least two different anti de Sitter vacua with the same vacuum energy, namely two extrema of the scalar potential $\varphi_0^{[1]}$ and $\varphi_0^{[2]}$ with $0 > \mathcal{V}\left(\varphi_0^{[1]}\right) = \mathcal{V}\left(\varphi_0^{[2]}\right)$.
- The two AdS vacua $\varphi_0^{[1]}$ and $\varphi_0^{[2]}$ are stable, that is the spectrum of small fluctuations around these points satisfies the Breitenlöhner Friedman bound.[1]
- There exists a smooth domain wall solution interpolating between these two vacua.

It is clear that the task is quite difficult due to the intrinsic complexity that the theory must have to satisfy these conditions and to escape the various no–go theorems [18], [19]. Although some partial results have been obtained some general questions still remain like the uplifting of the five dimensional solutions to M–theory solutions.

---

[1] For a review of this bound see for instance [37] Volume I.

Bibliography

[1] S. W. Hawking, Commun. Math. Phys. **43** (1975) 199.

[2] J. Beckenstein, Phys. Rev. **D 7** (1973) 2333; Phys. Rev. **D 9** (1974) 3292;
S. W. Hawking, Phys. Rev. **D 13** (1976) 191.

[3] J. P. Gauntlett, N. Kim, S. Pakis and D. Waldram, Phys. Rev. **D 65** (2002) 026003, [`hep-th/0105250`].

[4] J. M. Maldacena, Adv. Theor. Math. Phys. **2** (1998) 231, [`hep-th/9711200`].

[5] A. Ceresole and G. Dall'Agata, Phys. Lett. **B 482** (2000) 271, [`hep-th/0004111`].

[6] L. Randall and R. Sundrum, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83** 23 (1999) 4690, [`hep-th/9906064`];
J. Lykken and L. Randall, JHEP **0006** (2000) 014, [`hep-th/9908076`].

[7] L. Randall and R. Sundrum, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83** 17 (1999) 3370, [`hep-th/9905221`].

[8] J. Bagger and E. Witten, Nucl. Phys. **B 222** (1983) 1.

[9] K. Galicki, Commun. Math. Phys. **108** (1987) 117.

[10] N. J. Hitchin, A. Karlhede, U. Lindstrom and M. Rocek, Commun. Math. Phys. **108** (1987) 535.

[11] D. V. Alekseevskii, Math. Izv. USSR, **Vol. 9** (1975), No. 2, 297.

[12] M. Gunaydin, G. Sierra and P. K. Townsend, Nucl. Phys. **B 242** (1984) 244.

[13] M. Gunaydin, G. Sierra and P. K. Townsend, Nucl. Phys. **B 253** (1985) 573.

[14] B. de Wit and A. Van Proeyen, Commun. Math. Phys. **149**, 307 (1992), [`hep-th/9112027`].

[15] B. de Wit, F. Vanderseypen and A. Van Proeyen, Nucl. Phys. **B 400** (1993) 463, [`hep-th/9210068`].

[16] B. de Wit and A. Van Proeyen, *"Isometries of special manifolds,"* [`hep-th/9505097`].

[17] G. L. Cardoso, G. Dall'Agata and D. Lust, JHEP **0203** (2002) 044, [`hep-th/0201270`].

[18] R. Kallosh and A. Linde, JHEP **02** (2000) 005, [`hep-th/0001071`].

[19] K. Behrndt and M. Cvetič, Phys. Rev. **D 61** (2000) 101901, [`hep-th/0001159`].

[20] A. Ceresole, G. Dall'Agata, R. Kallosh and A. Van Proeyen, Phys. Rev. **D 64** (2001) 104006, [`hep-th/0104056`].

[21] A. Lukas, B. A. Ovrut, K. S. Stelle and D. Waldram, Nucl. Phys. **B 552** (1999) 246–290, [`hep-th/9806051`].

[22] A. C. Cadavid, A. Ceresole, R. D'Auria and S. Ferrara, Phys. Lett. **B 357** (1995) 76, [`hep-th/9506144`].

[23] K. Behrndt and M. Cvetič, Phys. Lett. **B 475** (2000) 253-260, [`hep-th/9909058`].

[24] K. Behrndt and S. Gukov, Nucl. Phys. **B 580** (2000) 225-242, [`hep-th/0001082`];
K. Behrndt, C. Herrmann, J. Louis and S. Thomas, JHEP **0101** (2001) 011, [`hep-th/0008112`];
K. Behrndt, S. Gukov and M. Shmakova, Nucl. Phys. **B 601** (2001) 49-76, [`hep-th/0101119`];
A. H. Chamseddine and W. A. Sabra, Nucl. Phys. **B 630** (2002) 326-338, [`hep-th/0105207`];
K. Behrndt and G. Dall'Agata, Nucl. Phys. **B 627** (2002) 357-380, [`hep-th/0112136`];
L. Anguelova and C. I. Lazaroiu, JHEP **0209** (2002) 053 [`hep-th/0208154`].

[25] K. Berhndt and M. Cvetič, Phys. Lett. **B 482** (2000) 271, [`hep-th/0201272`].

[26] G. L. Cardoso, G. Dall'Agata and D. Lüst, JHEP **0107** (2001) 026, [`hep-th/0104156`];
A. H. Chamseddine and W. A. Sabra, Phys. Lett. **B 517** (2001) 184 [Erratum-ibid. **B 537** (2002) 353].

[27] M. Gutperle and W. A. Sabra, Phys. Lett. **B 482** (2000) 271, [`hep-th/0104044`].

[28] S. L. Cacciatori, A. Celi and D. Zanon, Class. Quant. Grav. **20** (2003) 1503, [`hep-th/0211135`].

[29] J. P. Gauntlett, J. B. Gutowski, C. M. Hull, S. Pakis and H. S. Reall, Class. Quant. Grav. **20** (2003) 4587, [`hep-th/0209114`].

[30] J. B. Gutowski, D. Martelli and H. S. Reall, Class. Quant. Grav. **20** (2003) 5049, [`hep-th/0306235`].

[31] J. P. Gauntlett and S. Pakis, JHEP **0304** (2003) 039, [`hep-th/0212008`].

[32] M. M. Caldarelli and D. Klemm, JHEP **0309** (2003) 019, [`hep-th/0307022`].

[33] J. P. Gauntlett and J. B. Gutowski, *"All supersymmetric solutions of minimal gauged supergravity in five dimensions,"* [`hep-th/0304064`].

[34] S. L. Cacciatori and A. Celi, *"BPS equations in N = 2, D = 5 supergravity with hypermultiplets and vector multiplets,"* to be published

[35] S. L. Cacciatori and A. Celi, in preparation

[36] S. Coleman and J. Mandula, Phys. Rev. **159** (1967) 1251

[37] L. Castellani, R. D'Auria, P. Fré, *Supergravity and Superstrings: a geometric perspective,* WORLD SCIENTIFIC, Singapore 1991.

[38] B. de Wit, *"Supergravity,"* [`hep-th/0212245`];

For a general introduction to gauged supegravity theory see:
P. Fre, *"Gaugings and other supergravity tools of p-brane physics,"* [`hep-th/0102114`];

For a geometric approach to the construction of supersymmentric solutions in M–theory see:
J. P. Gauntlett, *"Branes, calibrations and supergravity,"* [`hep-th/0305074`].

[39] A. Van Proeyen, "$N = 2$ supergravity in $d = 4, 5, 6$ and its matter couplings", Extended version of Lecture given during the semester 'Supergravity, superstrings and M-theory" at Institut Henri Poincaré, Paris, November 2000.

[40] R. D'Auria, E. Maina, T. Regge and P. Fre, Annals Phys. **135** (1981) 237.

[41] B. de Wit, P. G. Lauwers and A. Van Proeyen Nucl. Phys. **B 255** (1985) 569.

[42] S. Cecotti, S. Ferrara and L. Girardello, Phys. Lett. **B 213** (1988) 443; Int. J. Mod. Phys. **A 4** (1989) 2475.

[43] R. D'Auria, S. Ferrara and P. Fre, Nucl. Phys. **B 359** (1991) 705.

[44] S. Ferrara, S: Sabharwal, Nucl. Phys. **B 332** (1990) 317.

[45] B. de Wit, F. Vanderseypen and A. Van Proeyen Nucl. Phys. **B 400** (1993) 463.

[46] S. Ferrara and P. van Nieuwenhuizen, Phys. Lett. **B 127** (1983) 70.

[47] M. de Roo, Phys. Lett. **B 156** (1985) 331.

[48] S. Cecotti, L. Girardello and M. Porrati, Phys. Lett. **B 151** (1985) 367.

[49] S. Ferrara, P. Fré and L. Girardello, Nucl. Phys. **B 274** (1986) 600.

[50] Y. M. Zinovev, Int. J. Mod. Phys. **A 7** (1992) 7515.

[51] S. Ferrara, L. Girardello and M. Porrati, Phys. Lett. **B 366** (1996) 155, [`hep-th/9510074`].

[52] P. Fre, L. Girardello, I. Pesando and M. Trigiante, Nucl. Phys. **B 493** (1997) 231, [`hep-th/9607032`].

[53] L. Girardello, M. Porrati and A. Zaffaroni, Nucl. Phys. **B 505** (1997) 272, [`hep-th/9704163`].

[54] B. de Wit and H. Nicolai, Nucl. Phys. **B 208**, (1982) 323.

[55] M. de Roo and P. Wagemans, Phys. Lett. **177** (1986) 352.

[56] M. de Roo and P. Wagemans, Nucl. Phys. **B 262** (1985) 644.

[57] P. C. C. Wagemans, *Aspects of $N = 4$ Supergravity*, Ph. D. Thesis, Groningen University, 1990, Universiteitsdrukkerij Groningen.

[58] M. Gunaydin and M. Zagermann, Nucl. Phys. **B 572** (2000) 131, [`hep-th/9912027`].

[59] M. Gunaydin and M. Zagermann, Phys. Rev. **D 62** (2000) 044028, [`hep-th/0002228`].

[60] M. Gunaydin and M. Zagermann, Phys. Rev. **D 63** (2001) 064023, [`hep-th/0004117`].

[61] L. Castellani, A. Ceresole, S. Ferrara, R. D'Auria, P. Fre and E. Maina, Nucl. Phys. **B 268** (1986) 317.

[62] L. Andrianopoli, M. Bertolini, A. Ceresole, R. D'Auria, S. Ferrara, P. Fre and T. Magri, J. Geom. Phys. **23** (1997) 111, [`hep-th/9605032`].

[63] P. Fré Nucl. Phys. **B Proc. Suppl 45B,C** (1996) 59.

[64] P. K. Townsend Phys. Lett. **B 148** (1984) 55

[65] S. S. Gubser, I. R. Klebanov, A. M. Polyakov, Phys. Lett. **B 428** (1998) 105, [`hep-th/9802109`];
E. Witten, Adv. Theor. Math. Phys. **2** (1998) 253, [`hep-th/9802150`].

[66] D. Z. Freedman, S. S. Gubser, K. Pilch and N. P. Warner, Adv. Theor. Math. Phys. **3** (1999) 363-417, [`hep-th/9904017`];
L. Girardello, M. Petrini, M. Porrati and A. Zaffaroni, Nucl. Phys. **B 569**

(2000) 451-469, [`hep-th/9909047`];
L. Girardello, M. Petrini, M. Porrati and A. Zaffaroni, JHEP **9812** (1998) 022, [`hep-th/9810126`]; JHEP **9905** (1999) 026, [`hep-th/9903026`];
S. S. Gubser, Class. Quant. Grav. **17** (2000) 1081, [`hep-th/9910117`];
O. DeWolfe, D. Z. Freedman, S. S. Gubser and A. Karch, Phys. Rev. **D 62** (2000) 046008, [`hep-th/9909134`];
I. R. Klebanov and A. A. Tseytlin, Nucl. Phys. **B 578** (2000) 123-138, [`hep-th/0002159`].

[67] K. Skenderis and P. K. Townsend, Phys. Lett. **B 468** (1999) 46, [`hep-th/9909070`].

[68] A. Lukas, B. A. Ovrut, K. S. Stelle and D. Waldram, Nucl. Phys. **B 552** (1999) 246, [`hep-th/9806051`];
P. Hořava and E. Witten, Nucl. Phys. **B 460** (1996) 506, [`hep-th/9510209`]; Nucl. Phys. **B 475** (1996) 94, [`hep-th/9603142`].

[69] M. J. Duff, *"TASI Lecture on branes, black holes and anti-de Sitter space,"* [`hep-th/9912164`];
L. A. London, Nucl. Phys. **B 434** (1995) 709;
K. Behrndt, A. H. Chamseddine and W. A. Sabra, Phys. Lett. **B 442** (1998) 97, [`hep-th/9807187`];
A. H. Chamseddine and W. A. Sabra, Phys. Lett. **B 477** (2000) 329, [`hep-th/9911195`];
D. Klemm and W. A. Sabra, Phys. Rev. **D 62** (2000) 024003, [`hep-th/0001131`].

[70] J. M. Maldacena and C. Nunez, Int. J. Mod. Phys. **A 16** (2001) 822, [`hep-th/0007018`].

[71] A. Van Proeyen, Published in *Karpacz 2001, New developments in fundamental interaction theories* 118-133, [`hep-th/0105158`].

[72] D. V. Alekseevsky, V. Cortes, C. Devchand and A. Van Proeyen, Commun. Math. Phys. **238** (2003) 525, [`hep-th/0109094`].

[73] K. Behrndt, M. Cvetic and W. A. Sabra, Nucl. Phys. **B 553** (1999) 317, [`hep-th/9810227`].

[74] A. Chamblin and G. W. Gibbons, Phys. Rev. Lett. **84** (2000) 1090, [`hep-th/9909130`].

[75] H. Lu, C. N. Pope, E. Sezgin and K. S. Stelle, Nucl. Phys. **B 456** (1995) 669, [`hep-th/9508042`];
H. Lu and C. N. Pope, Nucl. Phys. **B 481** (1996) 313, [`hep-th/9605082`];
M. J. Duff, H. Lu and C. N. Pope, Phys. Lett. **B 382** (1996) 73, [`hep-th/9604052`];

H. Lu, C. N. Pope and K. S. Stelle, Nucl. Phys. **B 476** (1996) 89, [`hep-th/9602140`].

[76] The literature on this topic is quite extended. As a general review, see the lecture notes:

K. Stelle, "Lectures on Supergravity p–Branes," Lectures presented at 1996 ICTP Summer School, Trieste, [`hep-th/9701088`].

[77] For a comprehensive updating on M–brane solutions see also

P. K. Townsend, "M–Theory from its Superalgebra", Talk given at the NATO Advanced Study Institute on Strings, Branes and Dualities, Cargese, France, 26 May - 14 June 1997, [`hep-th/9712004`].

[78] H. Lü, C. N. Pope, P. K. Townsend Phys. Lett. **B 391** (1997) 39, [`hep-th/9607164`].

[79] M. Cvetic, H. Lu and C. N. Pope, Phys. Rev. **D 63** (2001) 086004, [`hep-th/0007209`].